Vol. I] AUGUST, 1944 [Part 4

THE JOURNAL OF THE GANGANATHA JHA RESEARCH INSTITUTE

ALLAHABAD

Vol. I] AUGUST, 1944 [Part 4

THE JOURNAL OF THE GANGANATHA JHA RESEARCH INSTITUTE

ALLAHABAD

Published by
Mm. Dr. Umesha Mishra,
Ganganatha Jha Research Institute,
Allahabad.

Printed at
The Allahabad Block Works (P.) Ltd.,
Zero Road, Allahabad.

JOURNAL

OF THE

GANGANATHA JHA RESEARCH INSTITUTE

AUGUST, 1944.

CONTENTS

JOURNAL
OF THE
GANGANATHA JHA RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Vol. I] AUGUST 1944 [Part 4

A NOTE OF THE MĀṄKAṆI GRANT OF TARALASVĀMIN

By V. V. MIRASHI

As far back as 1894 Mr. H. H. Dhruva published in the *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. II, pp. 19 ff., an odd copper-plate found somewhere in the Saṅkheḍā *tālukā* of the Baroda State. The plate contained only the concluding portion of a grant, including benedictive and imprecatory verses, the name of the writer and the date, *viz.*, the year 346 expressed both in words and decimal figures. All other details such as the donor and the donee, the object of the grant, etc., were believed to be lost as the earlier plate or plates were not forthcoming. Mr. Dhruva, however, conjectured mainly from the evidence of palæography that the grant was made by a Gurjara king. He, therefore, referred its date, like the dates of other grants of early Gurjara kings, to the Cedi era and took it as equivalent to A.D. 595-96. As this was the earliest known instance of decimal notation in Indian inscriptions, the grant has attained considerable importance and has been frequently cited in discussions about the genuineness of early records whose dates are expressed in decimal figures.[1]

[1] See *e.g.*, Dr. V. S, Sukthankar's article 'Palæographic Notes' in *R. G. Bhandarkar Commemoration Volume*, pp. 319 ff.

Recently Mr. A. S. Gadre, Director of the Archæological Department, Baroda State, has published the missing first plate of this grant which was found at Māṅkāṇi in the Saṅkheḍā *tālukā*.[2] As Mr. Gadre has shown, the text of this plate ends exactly where that of the second plate begins. Their characters also completely agree. There is therefore, no doubt that the two plates make one complete grant.

The plates purport to record the grant, by Taralasvāmin of the Kaṭaccuri family, of a rice-field in the village Maṅkaṇikā which is undoubtedly Māṅkaṇi as shown by Mr. Gadre. Taralasvāmin is described as the son of Mahārāja Ṇaṇṇa and Dadā and the sister's husband of the illustrious Sūrya. The grant was made for the maintenance of five great sacrifices. The donee was the Brāhmaṇa Jyeṣṭhasena who belonged to the Jātūkarṇa gōtra[3] and the Vājasaneya Śākhā.

Of the Early Kaṭaccuris or Kalacuris we have in all four records,[4] two of which were found in Gujarat and the other two in the Nasik District of Mahārāṣṭra. From them we know of three kings, Kṛṣṇarāja, Śaṅkaragaṇa and Buddharāja who were ruling over Gujarat, Koṅkaṇ and Mahārāṣṭra from about A.D. 550 to A.D. 620. Taralasvāmin's grant of A.D. 595 falls in this period, but neither he nor his father Ṇaṇṇa who had the title of Mahārāja is named in any of the aforementioned records. Mr. Gadre, therefore, supposes that Taralasvāmin was

---

[2] *Important Inscriptions from the Baroda State*, Vol. I, pp. 4 ff. Mr. Gadre has kindly sent me excellent impressions of both the plates.

[3] As Mr. Gadre has pointed out this gotra recalls the name Jātūkarṇī of the mother of the celebrated Sanskrit poet Bhavabhūti.

[4] *Viz.*, the Ābhoṇa plates of Śaṅkaragaṇa (*Ep. Ind.*, Vol. IX, pp. 296 ff.), Saṅkheḍā plate of the same king's reign (*ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 21 ff.), and the Vadner and Sarasavaṇi plates of Buddharāja (*ibid.*, Vol. XII, pp. 30 ff. and Vol. VI, pp. 294 ff.).

holding only local sway in Gujarat. In that case he must have owed allegiance to the Kaṭaccuri Śaṅkaragaṇa whose Ābhoṇa plates were granted in the Kalacuri-Cedi year 347, *i.e.*, just a year after the date of the present grant. These plates were issued from the King's victorious camp at Ujjaini and record the donation of some land in the village Vallisikā in the viṣaya of Bhogavardhana (modern Bhokardhan in the Nizam's State). Gujarat was, therefore, plainly included in Śaṅkaragaṇa's dominion. This is also corroborated by another plate found in Saṅkheḍā which records a grant of the *Balādhikṛta* Śāntilla and mentions Śaṅkaragaṇa as his suzerain. Like Śāntilla, Taralasvāmin also seems to have been holding a subordinate position; for like the former he addresses his order to a king's officers (*rājapādīyas*) as well as his own. This king may have been Śaṅkaragaṇa.

There are certain indications which raise suspicion about the genuineness of this grant. It looks strange that unlike Śāntilla,[5] Taralasvāmin does not name his suzerain who, as we have seen was Śaṅkaragaṇa. He and his father Ṇaṇṇa are described in extravagant terms which would have been more appropriate in the case of such an independent king as Śaṅkaragaṇa. Besides, we find that in this period Śāntilla also was holding this very part of Gujarat, for the village Taṇḍulapadraka granted by him is identified with Tāndaljā, about 16 miles from Saṅkheḍā. It is, of course, possible to reconcile the two grants by supposing that Taralasvāmin either preceded or followed Śāntilla in the governorship of Gujarat, but in any case Taralasvāmin's silence about his suzerain remains inexplicable.

The decimal notation also, used in recording the date, causes suspicion about the genuineness of the grant;

---

[5] Śāntilla not only reverentially mentions Śaṅkaragaṇa, but also the latter's father Kṛshṇarāja.

for not only in the period, *viz.*, the end of the sixth century A.D., to which the record refers itself, but for more than 150 years afterwards the prevailing custom in Gujarat as in other parts of India was to record dates in numerical symbols. The inscriptions of the early Kalacuris, Gurjaras, Sendrakas and Cālukyas[6] who held Gujarat from the sixth to the eighth century A.D. are invariably dated in this manner. Even the Hānsoṭ plates[7] of Bhartṛvaḍḍha which were issued as late as V. 813 (A.D. 756) have their date expressed in numerical symbols. These plates were issued from Bharukaccha (modern Broach). Similarly, the Antroli-Charoli plates[8] of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Karka who succeeded the Cālukyas in Southern Gujarat use similar symbols to express their date Ś. 679 (A.D. 757). Except for the doubtful case of the present grant the earliest record from North India which contains a date in decimal figures is the Shergaḍh Buddhist inscription[9] of the Sāmanta Devadatta dated V. 847 or A.D. 791-92. In South India also the numerical symbols held the field for a long time. The earliest record from that part of the country which uses the decimal notation is the Dhulia grant of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa prince Karkarāja, dated Ś. 701 (A.D. 789-90).[10] It

[6] See D. R. Bhandarkar's *List of Inscriptions of Northern India*, Nos. 1204—1221.

[7] *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XII, pl. facing p. 203.

[8] *J. Bom. Br. R.A.S.*, Vol. XVI, plate facing p. 108.

[9] See plate of the date in *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XIV, p. 351. The dates of some earlier inscriptions recorded in the Gupta era are supposed to be in decimal figures. (See *e.g.*, G. 347 of Bhandarkar's *List*, No. 1357, G. 365 of No, 1361 and G, 387 of No. 1368). But they cannot be verified for want of facsimiles. Besides, later dates from the same locality such as G. 386 of No. 1367, G. 403 of No. 1370, etc., are known to be in numerical symbols which raises a strong presumption that the earlier dates also were in similar letter-numerals.

[10] *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. VIII, p. 186. The Sāmāngaḍ plates of Dantidurga, dated Ś. 675 (*Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XI, pp. 111 ff.) which were issued earlier, use the decimal notation, but they are re-

would seem, therefore, that the decimal notation began to supersede the numerical symbols both in North and South India about the same time, *viz.*, in the last quarter of the eighth century A.D.[10a] The present grant which purports to have been made as early as A.D. 595 and still has its date expressed in decimal figures appears to be suspicious.

There is another circumstance which strengthens the suspicion. The drafter of the present grant seems to have borrowed certain expressions from earlier Sendraka grants. Compare, for instance, the expression *avanata-sāmantāmala-mukuṭa-maṇi-nighṛṣṭa-caraṇa y u g a l-āra-vindaḥ* in line 1 of the present grant with *praṇat-āśeṣa-sāmanta-śiro-mukuṭa-nighṛṣṭa-pada-paṅkajaḥ* in l. 5 of the Bagumrā plates of Allaśakti (*Ind. Ant* , Vol. XVIII, p. 267). Similarly, *Kalpatarur-iv-opabhujja*(*jya*)*mān-ākṣiṇa-vibhavaḥ* in ll. 5-6 of this grant bears unmistakable resemblance to *Kalpa-talum*(*rur*)-*iv-ābhivāñchit-āśeṣa-jan-opabhujyamāna-vibhavo* in lines 7-8 of the Sendraka grant.[11] As these expressions occur in more than one genuine Sendraka record we cannot doubt that they originally belonged to them. Now, the Sendrakas held Gujarat till A.D. 656 at least. The present grant which seems to have borrowed these expressions from Sendraka records could not have therefore been made in A.D. 595.

---

garded as spurious. It is noteworthy that the recently discovered Ellorā plates of the same Rāṣṭrakūṭa king dated S. 663 (for 664) (A.D. 742) express their date in numerical symbols. See *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXV, pl. facing p. 29.

[10a] Mr. Kaye also says 'the ninth century A.D. is about the time when these symbols ceased to be fashionable for Indian inscriptions.' *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XL, pp. 44-5.

[11] Some other ideas such as fame being white like the moon and crossing the ocean are also common, but they are quite conventional and therefore afford no conclusive evidence of borrowing.

The evidence detailed above seems to point to the conclusion that the present grant was forged sometime in the second half of the eighth century A.D. The palæography of the grant as well as the shape of the numerical figures do not militate against this conclusion. These characters were probably current in Gujarat till the close of the eighth century A.D. The aforementioned Hānsoṭ plates of Bharṭivaḍḍha dated V. 813 (A.D. 756) and the Antroli-Chāroli plates of Karka, dated Ś. 679 (A.D. 757-58) are incised in similar characters. As for numerical figures, there are only three used in the present grant, *viz.*, 3, 4 and 6. Of these, the symbol for 3 occurs in this very form in the Goṇḍal plates (Set A), dated G. 405 (A.D. 724-25), while that for 4 occurs in a similar shape in the Kasare plates of Allaśakti (A.D. 653) and in a somewhat modified form in still later records such as the aforementioned Goṇḍal plates. The symbol for 6 has a peculiar form rarely noticed elsewhere in early records as remarked by Mr. Kaye,[12] but a somewhat similar form of the number is seen in the Shergaḍh inscription of Devadatta, dated V. 847 (A.D. 790-91) and the Ghumli grant of Jāika II, dated G. 596 (A.D. 886-87).[13]

It seems, therefore, that the Māṅkaṇi grant was forged sometime in the second half of the eighth century A.D.[14] It therefore affords no sure proof that the decimal notation was in vogue for Indian inscriptions as early as the sixth century A.D.[15]

---

[12] See Table II, *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XL, p. 52.

[13] *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXV, pl. facing p. 224.

[14] Mr. Kaye also regards this inscription as doubtful, *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XL, pp. 53, 54, n. 2.

[15] In view of the forged character of this grant and the doubtful evidence of such dates in decimal figures as G. 347 etc., Dr. Sukthankar's surmise that 'the Gurjaras and perhaps their neighbours in Gujarat had adopted the more advanced system of decimal notation much earlier than their contemporaries further south' (*R. G. Bhandarkar Commemoration Volume*, p. 319) does not appear to be valid.

NEGATION ACCORDING TO NAVYA-NYĀYA

By Tara Sankar Bhattacharya

Negation, according to Navya-Nyāya, is a category, because it is perceived to be characterising the place where the negation exists, *i.e.*, where something is negated. But it cannot be identified with other categories like substance, quality, action, universality, particularity and inherence, because their essence is affirmation and negation is other than affirmation.[1] And though it is a quality or meaning of the substratum, it is quite unlike any other quality. For all other qualities inhere or are internally lodged in their substances, but negation does not abide in the relation of inherence in its locus, inasmuch as a negation can be removed. The place where the jar does not exist, is qualified by the non-existence of the jar; but if the jar is replaced, then there is no longer the negation of the jar on the ground. Negation, therefore, does not inhere in its substratum, but resides in it in the relation of a type of self-identity (*svarūpa-sambandha*), which is called particularity (*viśeṣaṇatā*).

Negation not only implies the place which it qualifies, but also something negated. Negation, without reference to something negated, is inconceivable. Negation thus has both a locus or substratum and a positive counterpart which is negated. The former is called the *Anuyogī* and the latter *Pratiyogī*.[2] The *anuyogī* is determined by non-existence whose necessary *pratiyogī* or counterpositive

---

[1] *Sidhānta-Muktāvalī* on the verse No. 12 of the *Bhāṣāpariccheda*. *Cf.* Hobhouse: *Theory of Knowledge*, p. 154—"The negative judgment rejects or excludes the content which the affirmative accepts, and from this point of view negation is the contrary attitude of affirmation."

[2] *Cf.* Bradley: *The Principles of Logic*, Vol. I, p. 159—"In all negation we must have the assertion of a positive ground."

signifies that some affirmation must precede negation. A denial in itself and by itself is unmeaning, though denial is not identical with affirmation, *i.e.*, to deny is not *ipso facto* to affirm something.

These ideas, *viz.*, that the substratum of negation is qualified by it, that there is no negation as such, and that some amount of affirmation must be anterior to negation, have parallel in modern Western Logic. Thus Bradley says: "The affirmative judgment qualifies a subject by the attribution of a quality, and the negative judgment qualifies a subject by the explicit rejection of that same quality."[3] Again, he remarks: "Mere denial, however, rests in abstract exclusion, which as abstract is really nothing."[4] Here Bradley definitely is of opinion that non-existence is a quality of the real or the substratum and that there cannot be any negation *qua* negation. Similarly observes Welton: "We must have a positive ground for our denial, or it would be a mere set of words without meaning."[5] Bosanquet also thinks that affirmation precedes negation. He asserts: "On the other hand, negation does presuppose some affirmation, that is, the affirmation of a state of facts which, being judged true as a whole, carries with it the problematic affirmation, the affirmation as a possibility or enunciation as a conception in the world of meanings, of the idea 'suggested'. In this respect, therefore, affirmation is in the beginning of knowledge, at any rate, prior to negation."[6]

Negation is divided, in the first place, by Viśwanātha into negation of contact or relationship and mutual negation. Mutual negation exists in cases where two things cannot be identified and hence, one is not the other.

---

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 116.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 127.

[5] Welton: *Groundwork of Logic*, p. 47.

[6] Bosanquet: *Logic*, Vol. I, p. 280.

The negation of contact, which is other than mutual negation, is subdivided into prior negation, negation due to destruction and absolute negation. The prior negation is amenable to destruction. It is negatived by a future affirmation. When we say that the jar will be produced, we have an idea of the non-existence of the jar at present. Here there is a non-existence of the jar previous to its coming into being. This non-existence is removed as soon as the jar comes into existence.

The negation due to destruction is caused. Here the affirmative is removed and negation appears, whereas in the former (prior negation) the affirmation appears on the removal of negation. The proposition, "the jar has been destroyed," brings in the idea of the non-existence of the jar caused by its destruction.

Absolute negation is the denial of a relationship eternally. The judgment, "the jar is not," brings an idea of negation in the mind, which may be called absolute negation. Here a relationship of the jar with its substratum is denied without a reference being made to any particular time or place. In prior negation a relationship with the object negated (*Pratiyogī*) is denied at present. It has an implied reference to future affirmation of the *pratiyogī*. In negation due to destruction the relationship of the *anuyogī* with the *pratiyogī* is negated through some causality. But the absolute negation is neither conditioned, nor restricted to any particular moment of time or any particular point in space. It exists eternally at some place or other under the sun. The proposition, "the jar is not," means that the jar must be non-existent somewhere for all times. If the non-existence of the jar at a paricular place is removed by bringing a jar from another place, then there is non-existence of the jar at the place wherefrom it is removed.

The absolute negation, as explained above, is different from that of the Old School of Indian Logic (Prācīna-Nyāya) and has hardly any parallel in Western thought. For according to the New School, though the judgment, "the jar is not," is a case of absolute negation, yet during the time when the jar is actually present, one does not judge that the jar is absent, *i.e.*, the jar is negated. It means that though the jar is present here, it is absent somewhere. The whole of the universe cannot be filled up by jars at any moment. Hence there must be negation of jar always at some point of the globe. The Old School, on the contrary, thinks that absolute negation consists in contradiction. Two contradictory attributes, for example, are eternally negated of the same substance. From this standpoint the Old School objects against the New School that "in the substratum of the non-existence pertaining to destruction or of previous non-existence, there is no absolute non-existence. The notion that there is no red colour in the jar where chemical action has not changed the colour, and the notion that there is no dark colour in the red jar, mean respectively previous non-existence (of the red colour) and non-existence pertaining to destruction (of the dark colour), but not absolute non-existence (of the red and dark colours respectively); for they are contradictory to the latter."[7] In simple words, the force of this objection lies in the fact that in prior negation and negation due to destruction, say of the jar, there is only a temporary negation and hence there cannot be any absolute negation, *i.e.*, negation for all times, on the locus of these two kinds of negation, temporary negation and absolute negation being contradictory ideas.

Against this objection the New School urges that there is no proof of the above contradiction and hence

---

[7] Swāmī Mādhavānanda: *Bhāṣā-pariccheda* with *Siddhānta Muktāvalī*.

absolute non-existence can be present in the substratum of the previous negation and negation due to destruction. There is no contradiction, for example, between the judgment, "the jar will be," (previous non-existence) and the judgment, "the jar is not" (absolute non-existence). Hence in the substratum of previous non-existence there can be absolute non-existence.

In Western thought also absolute negation is not understood in this sense. What Johnson calls "pure negation" seems apparently to have similarity with the absolute[8] negation of the Navya-Nyāya. But there is a wide difference between the two. For Johnson's first form of pure negation is the attitude of rejection of an affirmative proposition. The proposition to be rejected is not negative in form. Here "the negative element does not enter within the content of the assertum, but expresses merely a certain mental attitude to the proposition itself."[9] We have found that the absolute negation of the Navya-Nyāya also expresses a mental attitude which denies a relation eternally, *i.e.*, the denial does not implicate itself with any particular moment of time, past, present or future; but the difference between the Navya-Nyāya and Johnson is that while the absolute negation of the former is negative both in form and meaning, the Johnsonian pure negation is so only in meaning.

Johnson's second form of pure negation, represented by a proposition like, "Wisdom is not blue," where "certain types of adjectives cannot be predicated of certain types of substantives," is rather akin to the mutual negation of the Navya-Nyāya[10] "then to its absolute negation. For by mutual negation it means a negative judgment where the identity of the subject repels the identity of

---

[8] Johnson: *Logic*, Part I, p. 66.

[9] *Ibid.*

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 67.

the predicate. The proposition, "the cloth is not a jar," is an example of mutual negation. Here the essence of cloth or clothhood repels the essence of jar or jarhood. In this case the negation is determined by the relation of identity and by no other relation. "The cloth is not a jar" means that the cloth is not identical with the jar. Here, therefore, the differentia between the two is identity. The identity of the cloth differentiates it from the jar. Hence, mutual negation may be defined as "that non-existence the counterpositiveness of which is determined by the relation of identity." It is evident that such a negative (the judgment that a cloth[11] is not a jar) is close to the judgment, "Wisdom is not blue" (Johnson's second form of pure negation). In the former judgment the identity of the subject is the determinant of the negation; similarly in the latter, the essence of the term, wisdom, is the determinant of the negation that blue cannot be a quality of it.

Previous non-existence is not caused by anything, but is not eternal. It is not caused because, it is meaningless to suppose a cause for the non-existence of a thing which will come into being in future. It is not eternal for the simple reason that the negation will be removed as soon as the thing will be produced. Thus previous non-existence has no origin, but is not eternal and, therefore, is not absolute.

Non-existence due to destruction has a cause, but is eternal. When the jar, for example, is destroyed by something, it cannot be affirmed again. Thus non-existence due to destruction is eternal, but caused, and hence is not absolute.

Both absolute negation and mutual negation have

---

[11] Swāmī Mādhavānanda's translation of Viśwanātha's definition of mutual negation, *anyonyābhāvattvam tādātmya-sambandhāvacchinna-pratiyogitākābhāvattvam.*

neither origin, nor temporal limitation. The proposition, "the jar is not," is eternally true in the sense that some portion of the universe must be without the jar always; and similarly in the proposition, "the cloth is not a jar," the cloth and the jar can never be identified. Mutual negation is also called difference.[12]

Absolute negation has several varieties. The first is the negation of all the particulars of a class. The proposition, "the jar in general is not in this room," means the negation of any type of jar, blue, red, etc., in the room. The second is the negation of two different things, *e.g.*, the negation of the jar and the cloth. The substratum of the non-existence of both the jar and the cloth is the support of this negation. The third type of absolute negation is the non-existence of either of the two alternatives, *e.g.*, either the jar or the cloth is not. The negation of a particular variety of a species is the fourth kind of absolute negation. When we say that the blue jar is not, we have such a negation. The next is the negation of the counterpositive as determined by its non-existence in a particular relation in a substratum (*Vyadhikaraṇa-sambandhāvacchinna-pratiyogitāka-abhāva*). The jar, for instance, does not exist in the relation of identity on the ground. The negation of the jar, as determined by its non-existence in the relation of identity on the ground, therefore, is a case of such negation. A negation of this kind is *Kevalānvayī* (a negation that exists everywhere), because the jar is universally negated in the relation of identity on the ground, which may be called its contradictory substratum considered from the relation of identity. The ground is not the contradictory locus of

[12] *Cf.* Hobhouse: *The Theory of Knowledge*, p. 155—"I conclude that negation is normally, but not always, equivalent to an affirmation of more or less definite difference; and the more highly developed, i.e., the more fruitful the negation, the more precise the difference."

the jar from the standpoint of other relations, for example, the relation of contact. There is a contact of the jar on the ground, when the jar is placed on it. But there cannot be an identity between the jar and the ground which, therefore, is its opposite locus (*Vyadhikaraṇa*) in the relation of identity.

The last kind of negation is the non-existence of the counterpositive as determined by the essence of its contrary (*Vyadhikaraṇa-dharmāvacchinna-pratiyogitāka-abhāva*).[13] The jar does not exist as the essence of the cloth. Here the non-existence of the jar is determined by the special character of the cloth, *i.e.*, the jar cannot exist being possessed of the special connotation of the cloth. The differentia of the cloth and the jar is the peculiar connotation of the former. This differentia negates the jar to exist as clothness (*Paṭatva*). This type of negation was recognised by Soṇḍala Upādhyāya.

---

[13] The expression literally means a negation of the counterpositive as determined by an essence or virtue whose substratum is different from the substratum in which the essence of the counterpositive inheres. The jar (the counterpositive) is the subtum of its essence (*paṭatva*). Now, the jar is negated as clothness whose substratum is the cloth which is different from the jar, the stratum of its essence (*Ghatatva*). The cloth again is the substra-substratum of jarness.

'KĀLIDĀSA AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES IN A TIBETAN REFERENCE[1]

By S. C. SARKAR

SUMMARY

[This short paper consists (i) of an English translation, in about 600 words, of a Tibetan passage taken from a cyclopædia of Buddhist Church historical traditions, entitled *Dpag. bsam. ljon. bsaṅ.,* compiled between 1722 and '47 by Ye. śes. dpal. aḫbyor. Sum. pa. Mkhan. po. from ancient and early medieval Indian and Tibetan works,—and (ii) of critical historical notes on points arising out of the Tibetan statements,—in about 4000 words.

It would appear from these Tibetan references that Kālidāsa was a contemporary of King Bhāgabhadra Śuṅga of Vidiśā, King Vīma Kusula Kadaphisa of Vārāṇasī and King Svāti Sātavāhana of Dākṣiṇātya and Aparānta, in the political sphere, and he married the learned daughter of King Vīma named Vāsantī; whereas in the literary sphere, he was a contemporary of Vararuci the Junior, Śaṅku, Bhā-varmā (a Sātavāhana prince) and Sapta-varmā,—all grammarians of the Aindra school of Bengal, who popularised it in the Peninsula. It also appears that Kālidāsa was a junior contemporary of the famous Nāgārjuna (scientist and philosopher), Saraha-pāda Rāhūla-Bhadra ('apabhraṁśa' poet and Tāntrik philosopher), and 'Indra'-Dhruva (the historical 'reviser' of the Indra-Vyākaraṇa),—all belonging to or working mainly in Bengal. It further seems probable that Kālidāsa is identical with Aśvaghoṣa, (*i.e.*, Kālidāsa I=Aśvaghoṣa I, leaving out other Kālidāsas and Aśvaghoṣas), and that Kālidāsa was the son of Saraha-pāda Rāhūla-Bhadra, and was a native of West Bengal in the Prācī,—and some details about his family and family habitations are traceable. From these statements and consequent probabilities it would appear that the 'first' Kālidāsa has to be placed in the middle of the 1st century B.C.. and the "Kadphises" period has to be shifted to *c.* 120 to

c. 27 B.C. (the 'Kaniṣka' and 'Huviṣka-Vāsudeva' periods being adjusted accordingly,—all this is in agreement with numismatic and traditional evidence); and the 1st Vikramāditya-Śakāri patron of the first "Kālidāsa" is to be recognised in Vīma Kusula Kadaphisa or Kadphises II (c. 67 B.C. to 27 B.C.), first established in Gangetic regions and then conqueror of Ujjainī from later Śuṅgas or Kāṇvas and Sakas of the West. The references also indicate that Vararuci II was a native of West Bengal like Kālidāsa I, and that Kālidāsa was also a scholar and a grammarian, while his first two (or his only) works were *Meghadūta* and *Kumāra-Sambhava*. It can be inferred that Kālidāsa began as a Tāntrika-Śākta poet and ended as a Tāntrika-Buddhist poet and philosopher, —which would explain the Tibetan identity of Kālidāsa= Aśvaghoṣa.]

Literal Translation of the Tibetan Text

King Bhāga-bhadra[2] was a friend and contemporary of Nāgārjuna, and Nāgārjuna[3] was a friend and contemporary of Vararuci.[4] Vararuci was in the Prācī,[5] in the province of Rāṛa,[6] where for 12 years he worshipped Avalokiteśvara.[7] He did much good service in the countries ruled by Sāta-vāhana, the king of the west[8] and by Bhīma-Śukala, king at Vārāṇasī [9] Afterwards[10] he went to Dākṣiṇātya[10] and became "purohita" of the king there.[10] That king wanted to study Vyākaraṇa from Vararuci,[11] and the latter (by the grace of Śeṣa-Nāga)[12] composed the *Mahābhāṣya* on Pāṇini.[13] [Only 25,000 ślokas could be thus composed by the Nāgas' grace, for Śeṣa-Nāga was seen and he fled; whereupon the subsequent 12000 verses Vararuci himself composed[14]]. The whole book he offered to the king, who, however, did not believe in it, and asked his own uncle Bhā-varmā[15] to worship Kālikā, and he doing it obtained (as boon) the Indra-Vyākaraṇa[16] as summarised by Śaṅku[17] and beginning with '*Siddho varṇa-samāmnāya*,' etc., in 15 pādas.[18] This was, again, edited by Vararuci and Sasta-Varmā,[19] and was known as *Kalāpa-Sūtra* (because compiled from

various sources, variegated like the peacock's tail), consisting of 25 chapters and 400 ślokas.[20] This was then presented to that king, who by studying it became a 'paṇḍita.'[21]

When Vararuci was the 'guru'[22] of Bhīma-Śukala, the king of Vārāṇasī, his daughter the Princess Vāsantī (Vasanta-vatī or V.°-dharā)[23] was presented to Vararuci by that king, but she disliked the idea of marrying him being a very learned lady.[24] Vararuci thereupon wanted to humiliate her.[25] He searched out a handsome[26] but foolish shepherd youth (discovering his parts while he was cutting away a branch on which he was sitting),[27] changed his dress to that of a 'brāhmaṇa paṇḍita,' taught him to utter 'svasti,' and instructed him not to say anything else when he met the king. Vararuci introduced him as his 'guru'[28] and asked the king to think over and bestow his daughter on him (the 'guru'). But (when the king offered him his daughter) the 'guru' forgot the word 'svasti' and uttered 'uṣṭra'[29] ('*u-ṣa-ṭa-ra*'),—which sounds (syllables) Vararuci forthwith explained away as referring to divinities and conveying the meaning of blessings ['*u*'= '*Umāyāḥ* (Umayā) *sahito Rudraḥ*', '*ṣ*'='*ś*'='*Śaṅkara-sahito puṇi*', '*ṭ*'='*ṭankāraḥ Śūla-pāṇi* (*sna*ɪ, and '*ra*'= '*rakṣantu Śiva sarvadā*'[30]]. Then the Princess was bestowed by the king on that fool, and Vararuci departed for the Dakṣiṇa country.[31]

The foolish cowboy never spoke anything; but once in a sacred place, in the passages thereof, he saw figures of donkeys, sheep, etc., represented,[32] and he expressed great delight; then it became clear that he was a cowboy. Soon the Princess' maid discovered him worshipping Kālī,[33] and the Princess hiding from behind (the image) threw a little of the chewed betel from her mouth at him,[34]—which he ate, thinking it was given to him by Kālī herself; from that very moment he became a great

poet, scholar and grammarian,[35] and he now composed the *Dūta* and *Kumāra-Sambhava*,[36] and thenceforward became famous as 'Kālidāsa.'[37]

NOTES

1. This is from *Dpag. bsam. ljon. bsaṅ.* by Ye. śes. dpal. aḥbyor. Sum. pa. Mkhan. po. (lit., '*Bhadra-Kalpa-druma*' by Kulācārya Jñāna-śrī of Sum.), who compiled this cyclopædia of Buddhist Church History in India and Tibet (from Buddha to his own days) between 1722 and 1747 (working at it for 25 years), basing it on early medieval Indian historians of Magadha and Mālawa, and other ancient Buddhist works, as also on original historical materials available to him in the Tibetan monasteric libraries. The historically reliable character of the information collected by him I have recently dealt with in several articles in *J.B. & O.R.S.* (December, 1940 June and September, 1941) and *Indian Culture* (Vol. 7, No. 2). This Tibetan work was printed long ago in 1908 by Rai Bahadur S. C. Dās, but has never been critically studied before. At present there is only one copy of it available in Calcutta (R.A.S.B.); I used (in 1935-36) a copy on loan from a Lama friend for a short time, and also compared it with a Xylograph copy secured similarly on loan, and found full agreement except for obvious printing mistakes in the edition of S. C. Dās.—The present extract from the work may be found in pp. 87-88 of S. C. Dās' edition. I have translated this portion *literally*, except that unessential passages have been closely paraphrased in short.—References in footnotes to Tibetan sources are mainly from the same *Dpag. bsam. ljon. bsaṅ.* and from *Mañju-śrī-mūla-kalpa* or Tārānātha.

2. The name may be translated either as Bhāga-bhadra or as Bhoga-bhadra; in Tibetan Xylograph 'bhāga' and 'bhoga' would be easy variations. From the synchronisms given here there can be no doubt that this king is the Bhāga-bhadra Kāśi-putra (probably also called Bhāgavata), the last but one Śuṅga king of Vidiśā, who reigned from 114 to 82 B.C., coming to the throne probably as a minor.

3. Nāgārjuna, according to Tibetan accounts, was one of the greatest all-India figures of the 2nd and the 1st century B.C., versatile in arts, sciences and metaphysics, secular scholar as

well as a spiritual saint. Tibetan works (of course based on and translated from Indian works) place him between 144 and 38 B.C. (lifetime of 106 years) (*e.g.*, MMK). The synchronism between Bhāgabhadra and Nāgārjuna is thus correct. Nāgārjuna is stated (by our author) to have worked principally in Puṇḍra-vardhana city in its Vihāra, specially when he was concerned with Chemistry and other Sciences along with his Bengali ('Vārendra') pupil Nāga-bodhi. This would largely explain how he could be a friend of Vararuci who also worked for long in Bengal.

4. This is Vararuci 'Phyi. ma.', the Junior, the Senior Vararuci being a contemporary of Mahāpadma Nanda along with Pāṇini, according to the Tibetan traditions; Mahāpadma, according to the same, was ruling in 406 B.C. (137 years after 543), having risen to power under the 3rd 'Nanda', *i.e.*, Śiśunāga king; the elder Vararuci was also a Buddhist, a sage and an author, and Mahāpadma had him killed; the younger Vararuci produced a *Mahābhāṣya* on Pāṇini (contemporary of the elder Vararuci).

5. Vide *Ind. Cult.*, op. cit., for the meaning of Prācī in ancient Tibetan Geography. 'Prācī' excluded Magadha, Kāśi and Kośala, but included Mithilā and Aṅga, and from that the whole region up to and including the Indo-Chinese Peninsula was Prācī; the specific implication of Prācī was Bengal (*i.e.*, Rāṛa, Vārendra or Puṇḍra, Baṅgāla ('Bhaṅgāla'), Gauḍa, Kāmarūpa and 'Cāṭigāvo').

6. *I.e.*, 'Rāḍha' as it is written in India in later times. So the Junior Vararuci, the contemporary of Kālidāsa, was (like him, as we shall see) a native of West Bengal. In Rāṛa, according to Tibetan accounts, there were important Buddhist monasteric universities, *e.g.*, the Trikaṭuka-Vihāra, the ruins of which, our author says, were excavated in a later age. Even in the time of Pratāparudra and Mukundadeva of Orissa in the 16th century, a fresh wave of Buddhism passed on to Orissa from this Rāḍha country (of which there are still traces).

7. *Vide* No. 6 above; that explains Vararuci's Buddhist monk life for 12 years. Both the Vararucis were Buddhists.

8. 'The Lord of the West' is also the title given to the Sātavāhana king by Khāravela (to Śrī Sātakarṇi, 168—157 B.C.). The period referred to in the present account being roughly the

last quarter of the second and the first three-quarters of the first century B.C., the historical correctness of the title 'King of the West' and the countries ruled over by him being placed in the West and in the Deccan, is quite clear.—The printed edition of 1908 has 'Śānti-vahana,' an obvious misprint and confusion due to the proper name of the Sātavāhana king, Svāti, or its various Svasti or Śānti. Svāti is more or less a contemporary of Bhāga-bhadra Śuṅga.

9. This is an important historical reference. I take 'Bhīma Śukala' to be no other than Vima Kusula, (son of Kusula Kara), *i.e.*, Kadaphisa II; 'Śukala' is an easy corruption from 'Kuśala', 'Kasula' or 'Kuśula', and may have originated from misreading of the name in some coin-legend or inscription or seal, wherein the 3 syllables were placed in a triangle or in a circle.—The 2 'Yakṣa' kings, Buddha and Gambhīra, of Tibetan references (e.g. *Mañ-juśrīmūlakalpa*) have already been identified with Kadaphisa I and II (Kuśula and Wima). '*Dpag. bsam.*' refers (p. 92) to the former's ruling from *Vārāṇasī* and receiving there an embassy from the Chinese Emperor; to the latter's rule over Sāgarī in Central India (Saugor, C.I.) where he patronised Ārya Asaṅga at the Uṣmapurī Vihāra (p. 97) and also to his (Gambhīra's) rule over Pāñcāla (p. 98); it also refers to one of the two kings' 'guru's, Mātṛ-ceṭa, same as Mati-citra and same as Aśvaghoṣa (pp. 109, 91, 92). For other synchronisms of these 2 kings in Tibetan references, *e.g.*, with the Candras (Later Mauryas) of Bengal, *vide J.B.O.R.S.*, December 1940 and June, September 1941.—The location and synchronisms of the Kadphisis kings as given above are quite plausible historically.

10, 10, 10. *I.e.*, after having his revenge upon Kadphises's daughter by getting her married to the as yet unknown Kālidāsa (='Ma. Khol.' or Mātṛ-ceṭa, =Aśvaghoṣa, according to Tibetan references), he fled to the Sātavāhana court at Pratiṣṭhāna on the Godāvarī, and became the 'purohita' of Svāti.

11. An easily intelligible desire, since (i) the Sātavāhana dynasty and realm was more in touch with Prākṛts and Southern vernaculars than with Northern Sanskrit, and (ii) Vararuci of the Prācī (Bengal) represented an ancient, apparently a pre-Pāṇinian grammatical tradition of that region, which due to the influence of the Buddhistic monasteric universities, tried to make Sanskrit grammar easy and pliable for the general readers, and

justified unorthodox forms (*e.g.*, Aindra, Cāndra and Kātantra systems); also since (iii) the contemporary Andhras tried to imitate the foreign rulers of the North in their patronage of Sanskrit (which was thus introduced as medium even of Buddhist religious writings in this period).—As we shall see, whereas the 'elder' Vararuci is identified in tradition with the Grammarian Kātyāyana, and Pāṇini and Nanda are stated to be his contemporaries,—this 'junior' Vararuci is stated to be the originator of the composite Kalāpa system based on his own '*Mahābhāṣya*' and the Aindra system.

12. Vararuci being a friend of Nāgārjuna who came from the South, would naturally seek the divine favour of the great Nāga; this friendship must have been a good introduction for him to the Southern Court.

13. This would be the Prācī or Eastern Buddhist School's '*Mahābhāṣya*' on Pāṇini, as compared with the slightly earlier Madhyadeśa or orthodox Brāhmaṇical School's '*Mahābhāṣya*' by Patañjali. The differentiation became clear from the time of Nanda when both Pāṇini and Kātyāyana (Vararuci I) wrote.

14. This might mean that Vararuci added 12000 verses to a grammar of 25000 verses which he regarded as classical and authoritative, i.e., the standard work of the Eastern School to which he belonged. Possibly this work was the revised Indra-Vyākaraṇa composed somewhat earlier by Indra-Dhruva, a brāhmaṇa of the Prācī, in 25000 ślokas (as Sum. pa. says elsewhere, as also Tārānātha), under the patronage of his friend Candanapāla, king of one of the Prācya kingdoms of the time, and a contemporary of Saraha-Rāhūla (*vide infra*).

15. This Sāta-vāhana prince Bhā-varmā is probably different from Sasta (Sapta or S(S)arva)-varmā below,—though the Sāta-vāhanas also claimed to be brāhmaṇas. Bhā-varmā's attempt was thus the second one to produce a primer for the Southern Court. It is clear that Sanskrit was already being used by notables in the Andhra court,—the uncle and the wife of the king being experts in that archaic medium.—'Kālikā' in the text here is probably a scriptural mistake for Kārtika (which is the general tradition).

16. The point seems to be that while the King was doubtful about the usefulness of Vararuci's first attempt, an earlier Indra-

Vyākarṇa of 25000 ślokas *plus* his own supplement of 12000 verses,—his own uncle Bhā-varmā, acquainted with the special difficulties of the Southerners, yet used the same Indra-Vyākaraṇa as the ultimate basis, only he used an abridgment of it, while Vararuci used the whole work. This was evidently because the Aindra school's arrangement and treatment was more suited for popular instruction and less full of technicalities.

17. Śaṅku's summary of Indra-vyākaraṇa has not perhaps survived. Or, it may be that prince Bhā-varmā, jointly with Śaṅku, whose services he utilised, produced this abridgment of the bigger Aindra-vyākaraṇa,—and this began with '*Siddho-varṇa*'—etc., and was complete in "15 pādas".

18. It should be noted that the Kātantra (=Kātyāyana-tantra) or Kalāpa grammar of later medieval ages contains 28 pādas, of which 3 are obvious interpolations; *vide* note 20 below.

19. 'Sasta' is scriptual variation for Sapta, Sarva or Śarva. The point is that Vararuci comes in again, and he helps in preparing the finally approved primer for the Sātavāhana court; he has now got that court's point of view, and has the further assistance of another Southern brāhmaṇa; the work became popular in Bengal also, as Vararuci was a Bengali,—and in the time of Naya-pāla and Candra-gomi, Īśvara(-varmā) produced a fresh edition of Kalāpa.

20. As noted above, 28 less 3 interpolated sections would make the 25 sections of Kalāpa known in earlier days. It is clear that Vararuci added 10 more 'pādas' to the 15 of Bhā-varmā and Śaṅku. It is not clear who is responsible for the 400 ślokas.—The explanation given here of the name Kalāpa is certainly more reasonable than the one based on Kārtika's peacock; this is the Buddhistic secular explanation as distinct from the brāhmaṇical mythological.

21. In about the middle of the first century B.C. the Andhra court becomes 'Sanskrito-phil'.; in a century however it becomes 'Prākrito-phil.' In between, between Svāti and Hāla, Sanskrit, associated chiefly with the foreign ruling clans of India, must have fallen into disfavour again as such,—*i.e.*, since the Sakas became bitter and successful foes of the Andhras and pushed them back from North and Central India; in the time of Svāti (*i.e.*,

of Bhāgabhadra, Kusula and Wīma or Vararuci, Nāgārjuna and Kālidāsa), the Andhra position was much stronger, and they could lightly follow Śaka-Yue-chi fashion of patronage of Sanskrit (probably based on Śuṅga reaction against Mauryan, and judged by the foreigners shrewdly as a potent instrument for undermining Buddhism as a national force while outwardly patronising it).

22. *I.e.*, after he had 'done much good service' (probably in the cause of Buddhism) in the Sāta-vāhana kingdom of Deccan, and apparently in the Śuṅga kingdom of Malwa also (Bhāga-bhadra being Nāgārjuna's friend and thus his too); before all this he was for 12 years in Rāṛa as a monk; so he would be about 40 at the time when he repaired to the court of Bhīma at Vārāṇasī; and he must have left it shortly afterwards, say when he was about 45,—a suitable age for being rejected as a husband by a proud, educated young princess.—Like Vararuci,. Mātṛ-ceṭa-Maticitra-Aśvaghoṣa, all identified in Tibetan references with Kālidāsa (*Ma. Khol.*) are stated to have held the position of 'guru' at the 'Yakṣa' court.

23. Two other 'Yakṣa' (Yueh-chi) princesses are known in history; one is the mother of the Śuṅga King Bhāgabhadra-Kāśiputra (the princess of Kāśī here can only mean a member of the family of the two Yakṣa kings of Vārāṇasī referred to already, possibly a sister or aunt of Kadphises I); the other is the mother of Dharma-Candra of Bengal of the Candra or later Mauryan Dynasty and Queen of Śrī--Candra, also either a sister, or (preferably) an aunt of Kadphises I [*vide J.B.O.R.S.* December 1940, June and September 1941]. It would seem that Kadphises I (Buddha-Yakṣa) was not the first Yueh-chi emperor in India proper, and that this position belongs to his immediate predecessors; perhaps he bore the name of Kara Kadaphisa, while Kadphises I was Kusala Kara (and his successor Wima Kusala or Bhīma Śukala). It seems clear that this first Yue-chi conqueror (approximately between 120 and 107 B.C.) sought to secure his position by matrimonial alliances with both the Buddhistic later Mauryans and the Brāhmaṇical Śuṅgas, so that his daughters' (or sisters') sons would be ruling over the territories of the two dynasties still claiming imperial rank. This explains the middle position of the Yueh-chi kings between Buddhism and Brāhmanism, while the capital at Vārāṇasī explains their Bull symbol,

etc.—One thing is at any rate clear,—Kālidāsa was related to the Yueh-chi (Yakṣa), Śuṅga and Candra (later Mauryan) Royal Families. The growing Indian culture of the Yueh-chi dynasty is shown by the readiness with which Wima offers his daughter to mere scholars of monasteric or literary reputation. instead of primarily thinking of politic royal marriages.

24. The age of Vararuci must have been a stronger reason than her estimate of his learning, as the subsequent incidents show.

25. This shows the Buddhist monk-scholar in a normal human mood. That is why he fled to the Andhra court as soon as Vāsantī was married. In tradition Vararuci and Kālidāsa are said to have been friends in the court of their common patron, a 'Vikramāditya'; it is quite understandable how sometime later on when Kālidāsa stood revealed as a great poet, the general reconciliation could take place.

26. Vararuci guessed that a handsome youth would be a catch, and learning would be a secondary point. It is something that we hear our elusive ancient great poet was an attractive person like Ravīndra of our days; if he is the same as Aśvaghoṣa (as the Tibetan references indicate), some details are also known about the great poet's home town and province, and about his parentage and early life: briefly (*cf. Dpag. bsam.*, p. 91). his father was a brāhmaṇa named Saṅgha (or Saragha, Saraha)-guhya(-guha), and his mother was the young daughter of a merchant, who was given away in marriage (being perhaps in *loco parentis* to her,—*vide infra.*) to Saṅgha or Saragha by Pitṛdāsa the Senior, who was 'guru' to Śrī-Candra of Bengal (already mentioned as later Mauryan contemporary of Kadphises I); all three, and this event, belonged to and happened in 'the city of Khor. ta.' (probably wrong for Ahkhor. rta.=Wheel and Horse) in the Prācī (*i.e.*, Śrī-Candra's kingdom of Aṅga, Vaṅgāla, etc.); the Indian name of this town must have been 'Cakra-dhara-pura', or 'Cakra-baḍavā-pura' [*cf.* mod. place names 'Cakradharpur' or 'Cakrabeḍe'], or other synonymous combination; it is possible however to take 'Khor. ta.' as a Tibetan attempt to render a Bengal place name phonetically; cf. mod. place names like Khardā or Khurdā in that region. It also appears that the original name of Aśvaghoṣa=Kālidāsa was Kṛṣṇa, (or Kāla(ā)(ī)), and as he grew into fame, he acquired a large number of alternative appellations;

he was also called 'Pitṛ-dāsa Junior', after his mother's guardian. The 'title' Aśva-ghoṣa may be explained as "one who has made the town having the name of 'Aśva' (*i.e.*, 'Ahkhor. rta.') famous" or "the pride of 'Aśva'-town." It also appears (from *Dpag. bsam.*, pp. 84-85, with p. 91) that Saragha (Saraha)-guhya was also known as Saraha-bhadra, Saraha-wā (S°-pā) or Saraha, and as abbot of Nālanda (in which post he was succeeded by Nāgārjuna from Puṇḍravardhana) he was known as Rāhūla-bhadra. He was ranked by some as a Kṣatriya, but was the son of a Tāntrik Buddhist nun (Ḍākinī) by a Brāhmaṇa, born in the city named Rāijnā in a Prācya kingdom. He is also stated to have chosen the 'Yoginī' daughter of an arrow-merchant of Mahārāṣṭra as his consort for Tāntrik rituals [probably the same as the merchant's daughter to whom he was formerly married by Pitṛ-dāsa of Nālanda who acted as her father], and to have been the first preacher and populariser of Vajrayāna Tāntrikism (with Mahāmudrā, etc.), it being confined to Orissa court before this time (*i.e.*, the half century following Khāravela), and also the first to compose the Dohā class of songs for Buddhism, which he employed with great success in converting thousands, from princes to common men, to his new interpretation of Buddhism. [Some Dohās of Saraha-pāda have been preserved in Bengal, of course in somewhat modified dialect]. If, following Tibetan references, we accept the identity of Kālidāsa and Aśvaghoṣa,—we may conclude that the great classical poet of India had quite an extraordinary heredity, and an environment of intellectual aristocracy in touch with royal courts; and the creative religious poetry of his scholarly father (whose activities spread from the classrooms of Nālanda to courts of Kings like Śrī-Candra, Candanapāla and Ratnapāla, and to the huts of the poor), and the intellectual quality and emotional mysticism of his once cloistered mother and grand-mother, must have moulded to a large extent the stuff in the great poet,—to which the finishing touches were given by his scholarly and appreciative wife, the princess Vāsantī.—Could we now say Kālidāsa is but a name? There is a curious parallel between Ravīndra's father the great 'Maharṣi' being a scholar and a religious poet and reformer, and the classic poet's father of repute in religious poetry and history. It would seem after all that Kālidāsa was a Bengali (and a Tāntrik Buddhist) by birth, perhaps born of a Marāthi mother. *Cf.* Caṇḍīdāsa of

Bengal, who combines many shades from Buddhism and Vaiṣṇavism to Śaktism.

27. The story of a 'shepherd' youth may have originated from the name 'Aśva-ghoṣa'. What Vararuci could easily do would be to take charge of a bright but do-nothing wayward youth, being the son of a scholar whom he must have known very well at Nālanda or in Bengal, *i.e.* of Saraha the Abbot-Poet,—and pass him off at the foreign Yueh-chi court as a great scholar,—satisfying his conscience that it would not be a very great outrage. The 'branch-cutting' story illustrates the wayward, unreasonable nature of genius at an immature stage. On this slender basis all the other stories about inability to pronounce or understand Sanskrit words, etc., have grown.

28. He could surely be introduced as a 'guru-putra', if not as 'guru'; probably Vararuci *did* so, and was only trying (successfully) to conceal the as yet unpolished character of the youth. This would explain the readiness with which Wīma and Vāsantī both assented to the proposal.

29. The 'uṣṭra' comes in in other Indian forms of the Kālidāsa legend also. The origin again seems to be in the name 'Aśva-ghoṣa'. *Vide* also note 32 below; possibly this eccentric son of a scholar-poet had neglected studies orthodox, and had been taking genuine delight in farming as a hobby,—and that is another good basis of the various stories making the poet a foolish cowboy at first.

30. The Sanskrit passages in the Tibetan text here are corrupt, and should be verified and checked from Sanskrit versions.

31. Obviously to avoid trouble, and no other court except the Sātavāhana one was then safe for him, since the Candras and the Suṅgas were both allied to the Yueh-chis.

32. These evidently refer to the sculptured 'jātaka' friezes of Sārnāth (Mṛgadāva near Vārāṇasī) which were still fully intact; the future poet was evidently interested in the artistic quality of these examples of animal sculpture. Was Kālidāsa an all-round artist also, like Ravīndra? His writings would rather indicate it. He (Aśva-ghoṣa) was a great musician.

33. *I.e.*, 'Tārā', 'Caṇḍī'. This is explained by his mother having been a 'Tāntrik Yoginī', and his grandmother being a Tāntrik 'Ḍākinī', as well as his father (Saraha-Rāhūla) being a

Vajrayāna Mahāmudrā-Sādhaka. Vārāṇasī was also an ancient Śakti worship centre; Vindhyācala the great Śakti-pīṭha is close to it; Śiva-Śakti gold miniatures of Indo-Scythic period are known. Probably since the poet regarded his powers as a gift by the grace of Śakti, his first work '*Kumāra*' (beg. with '*asti*',—whereby hangs another significant Kālidāsa legend), is practically a Śakti-Kāvya.

34. The princess was evidently educated in the orthodox Buddhist way; she came to scoff and stayed to admire.—It seems to me that Kālidāsa represents in himself a synthesis between Buddhism and Śakti-ism, which was made possible by his parentage and matrimony; taking Kālidāsa as identical with Aśvaghoṣa, this synthesis (with emphasis on Śakti-ism in earlier years and Tāntrik Buddhism in later years) explains on the one hand the great similarity in language and style between the writings of the two (now wrongly taken to be separate), and on the other the ability of the same poet and philosopher to tap Brāhmaṇical, Tāntrik and Buddhistic lore, episodes and legends, and to appeal to the minds of all classes of contemporary readers equally well. One reason for the late medieval separation of Aśvaghoṣa and Kālidāsa may easily have been this that the synthesis, versatility and universal appeal of the poet was slowly forgotten with the decline of Buddhism in India, and the growing antagonism between Brāhmaṇism and Buddhism in the six centuries after Kālidāsa (1st 6 centuries A.D.);—and while the Hindus remembered the poet as 'Mātṛ-ceṭa' or Kālidāsa only (leaving out his other appellations), the Buddhist not only remembered these (Mātṛ-ceṭa, etc.), but in accordance with their usual historical practice, recorded as well the name of 'Aśva-ghoṣa' based on his home-town, and stated the identity.

35. It is significant information that Kālidāsa was also a great linguist and scholar; identified with Aśvaghoṣa, this is clear and true; even otherwise, the combination of these three functions is not at all rare in Indian literary history; *e.g.*, Vararuci II (*cf.* Vararuci I, who wrote *Viśeṣa-Vyākhyā Kāvya*), Bhartṛhari, etc.,—down to even Ravīndra-nātha.

36. It is interesting to note that this version of the Kālidāsa tradition does not mention other works usually attributed to he poet; either the original Kālidāsa wrote only these two, or these two were the first productions of the poet (the one begin-

ning with '*asti*' first, and that beginning with '*kaścit*' second,—as another tradition has it.

37. *I.e.*, when he wrote these two, he used the variant name 'Kālidāsa', his usual name being 'Mātṛ-dāsa'; It was a sort of pen-name, with a pun on his earlier name of Kṛṣṇa (=Kāla(ā)(ī)).

WHO WAS THE FOUNDER OF THE VIKRAMA ERA*

By M. V. Kibe

Almost all the western scholars, and a few of the Indians[1] bring down the date of the composition of at least some of the Sūktas of Ṛgveda to 600 B.C. On the other hand, some of the eastern scholars would carry back the date of Candra Gupta Maurya to the 16th Century B.C.[2]

Mr. Triveda is of the opinion that the Sheet Anchor of the Indian History fixed by Sir William Jones in the year 1795, *viz.*, the contemporaneousness of Alexander the Great and Candra Gupta Maurya, which is based on the similarity between the name Sandrakotus and him, given in the Greek records, and certain other facts, but which is not compatible with the original statements of the Purāṇas, which were also known to the Greeks, is wrong.[3] The average period of 20 or 25 years assigned to each reign of the kings named in the Paurāṇika dynasties is also wrong because, (a) the reigns of some kings are known to be longer and, (b) some names of minor and unimportant kings have been omitted, which can be proved from the treatment accorded to dynastic names, even in the so-called historical period fixed by the western scholars. According to Mr. Mankad, the Sandrakotas of the Greek was Samudra Gupta, the son of Candra

---

*A paper submitted to the 12th All India Oriental Conference held at Benares, 1944.

1 Mr. Shethe's *Certain Vedic Avastan and Greek Traditions and the Age of Ṛgveda—A.B.O.R.I.* Jubilee No. pp. 451-464.

2 Mr. Mankad's "*Manvantara-Chaturyuga Method*" (*ibid.*, pp. 271—290).

3 Dr. Triveda's "*Sheet Anchor of Indian History*" (*ibid.*, pp. 581—592).

Gupta I, the founder of the Gupta dynasty. Hence the period of the Guptas is carried back by more than thousand years. According to Dr. K. P. Jaiswal, the Guptas were Karaskar Jats.[4] As the Guptas revived Hinduism, which had gone down before the Baudhas, they were incorporated in the Kṣatriya-varṇa and may thus have come to be regarded as one of the four—say Agnikula-families, born out of the Agni-Kuṇḍa at Mt. Abu, but this story is of modern origin, so also, is the statement that the Vikramāditya was a Paramara of later origin. However, at least according to Hāla's *Saptaśatī*, which some scholars hold to belong to the 1st Century B.C., there was a famous king named Vikramāditya, reigning at that period.

Mr. Mankad in his paper already referred to[2] maintains that a Manvantara caturyuga computation of 40 years, was in existence and the years of the dynasties given in the Purāṇas, which are up to the end of the Andhra dynasty, are given in its terms. It appears that it was replaced by the Vikrama Samvat, after an interegnum of about a few years. The interegnum covered the periods of the reigns of Candra Gupta I to the beginning of the reign of Skanda Gupta I, who was the last Gupta King, who defeated the Śakas and Hūṇas. This will be presently supported.

If, therefore, the basis of the enumeration of the years given in the previous paragraphs has a solid foundation, which there is no reason yet available to doubt, the Buddha's death is carried to 1790 B.C. and of Aśoka's reign to about three centuries later.[2] From the Mauryas to the end of Andhras, intervenes a period of about a thousand years. An interval of about six hundred years must be regarded as the dark age in history which is now

---

[4] Dr. K. P. Jaiswal's "*Imperial History of India*" (pp. 155-156).

held to be from the Mauryas to the Guptas—age now held to begin after the Guptas, who are held to have existed in the fourth century B.C. Indifferent attention has been paid to the references in existing literature for a history of India, based on newly discovered works such as *Kaumudī Mahotsava* and *Mañjuśrī Mūlakalpa*. It has brought to light the Vakāṭaka Empire, but it covered mid-India only between 150 and 350 A.D., the pre-Gupta period as at present understood in accordance with the *Sheet Anchor* of Sir William Jones.

If, therefore, Candragupta I, or his son, Samudra Gupta be held to be the contemporary of the invasion of Alexander and of Selukas Nicator, a period of nearly three centuries is required to be filled up by the Guptas up to Skanda Gupta who all called themselves Ādityas or Vikramādityas[2] or simply Parākrama, a variant of Vikrama,[5] Skanda Gupta I, took up the title of Vikramāditya. The names of those Imperial Guptas known up to now are Candra Gupta I, Rāma Gupta, Samudra Gupta, Candra Gupta II, Kumāra Gupta and Skanda Gupta. The exact period to be counted being 275 years, to fit in Skanda Gupta with 56 B.C., the average reign of these, comes to about 45 years. Now it is known that Candra Gupta reigned for 7 years, Rāma Gupta only for a few years and Candra Gupta II for 51 years. Deducting these nearly 59 years of those three Kings, the period of the reigns of the remaining three averages 90 years each, which is rather too long. The only surmise possible is that like the dynastic names of individual kings given in the Purāṇas some names of unimportant rulers have been left out. It will be seen that the average for six kings is not inordinately long.

---

[5] A forthcoming paper on Gupta coins by Mr. Diskalkar, Curator, Indore Museum.

In one of the previous paragraphs, reference has been made to the pre-Gupta, that is to say, the pre-Greek invasion period. The history of this period fits in well, with the scattered information which can be culled from the *Vaṁśānu-caritam* of the Purāṇas, commencing from Manu Vaivaswata, *Bṛhat-Kathā*, which is now thought to be extant only in the shape of the *Kathā-saritsāgara* of the first Millennium of the Christian era, the Gāthās of Jainas, the stories in Bhāsa's dramas, the references in Kālidāsa's *Meghadūta* to Pradyota, Udayans, Vāsava-dattā, Vaccarāja and the antiquity of Ujjain from the time of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, at least from that of the Pre-Aśokan period and fit in well with one another. So also do the story of the *Mṛcchakaṭika*, and the conquests of Raghu in the *Raghuvaṁśa*.

Only four acts of Bhāsa's *Cārudatta*, which is the basis of the same acts of the *Mṛcchakaṭika* are available. Dr. Oliver of the Illionis University (U.S.A.) writes that Pālaka of the *Mṛcchakaṭika* was a son of Pradyota of Ujjain.[6] This is based on Bhāsa's *Pratijñā-Yaugan-dharāyaṇa* (Act II, Stanza 13). It appears from the stories of Bhāsa's *Swapna-Vāsavadattā*, and *Mṛccha-kaṭika*, combined, that on account of Udayan and Pālaka being competitors for the hand of the daughter of the king of Vatsa, *viz.*, Padmāvatī, there was revolution at Ujjain and Pālaka was overthrown. He also appears to have been a tyrant like his brother or father Pradyota; like him Candra Gupta II bore the title of Caṇḍa-Mahāsena.[2]

In the *Puñcāṅgas* the names of six founders of different eras are given. It is written therein that after a lapse of 135 years Vikrama Samvat will be replaced.

---

[6] *The Trial of Cārudatta in Modern Setting*, by Lt.-Col. T. J. Kedar, Vice-Chancellor, Nagpur University.

Ujjayinī was occupied by Candra Gupta II, but it seems that it passed out of the hands of his descendants, until it was re-conquered by Skanda Gupta I, who according to what has been hitherto displayed, reigned in the 1st Century B.C. According to Dr. Hemchandra Joshi, D.Litt.,[7] an eulogy (प्रशस्ति) dated 63 V. S. has been found in the Deccan and 103 in the Punjab. He further says that mention of Vikrama is found in the *Skanda-Purāṇa*, and quotes Prof. Eggerton as saying that a King, having the title of Vikramāditya, reigned at Ujjain in 57-56 B.C.

Skanda Gupta defeated the Hūṇas, who may be identified with the Śākas or a mixture of both, and maintained the glories of the Guptas, and became the last prominent king of the dynasty. It is said, as already pointed out in the previous paragraph, that Vikrama Samvat was superceded by Śālivāhana, who started his own era after 135 years of the former's era. This Śālivāhana was no doubt a Sātavāhana, which was a Mahārāṣtra dynasty.[8] It appears that there is a strange mixture of dates in these two eras in subsequent literature which can be solved in the following way: Śālivāhana's era may have prevailed even in the North of the Narmadā but the sway of Sātavāhanas in these parts was interrupted by Kuśānas, Kṣatrapas, and others, who ruled over Ujjain. The subsequent king of these parts, who expelled or defeated the foreigners, was Yaśodharman, who also called himself Vikramāditya. The king, who according to Alberuni, defeated the Hūṇas at Karur, was this king. It appears from Bhavabhūti's dramas that the city of Ujjain had assumed a secondary place. This was probably after the Sātavāhanas had

---

[7] *Vikramāditya*, by Dr. Hemchandra Joshi. D.Litt., (Berlin), in Hindi.

[8] Jogalekar's "*Home of the Sātavāhanas*" (op. cit., pp. 196—205).

receded from these parts. The name of Malava Ganana, belonged to this period, and continued even after Yaśodharman.[9] It is claimed that there is ample evidence for the presumption that Skanda Gupta I, was the founder of the Vikrama era.

[9] Vikrama Samvat in *Sahyadri* (Marathi) October, 1943, by Dr. Altekar.

AYODHYĀ IN ANCIENT INDIA

By B. C. Law

Geographical position

Ayodhyā or Ayojjhā or Ayudha is one of the seven holy places of the Hindus.[1] Fa-Hien calls this town as Sha-che and according to Ptolemy it is known as Sogeda. Its capital was Sujanakot or Sancankot, 34 miles north-west of Unao in Oudh on the river Sai in the Unao district. In the Brāhmaṇa Literature we find that Śunaḥsepa speaks of this town as a village.[2] According to the *Vividhatīrthakalpa*[3] of the Jains, Ayodhyā is also known as Vinitā, Sāketa, Ikṣvākubhūmi, Rāmapurī and Kośala. It is the birthplace of Ṛṣabha, Ajita, Abhinandana, Sumati, Ananta, and Acala. Seven Jain preceptors were born here. According to this Jain work, Ayodhyā was 12 yojanas long and nine yojanas broad.[4] This town is situated on the banks of the Sarayū river,[5] about 6 miles from the Fyzabad Railway Station. It is also a sacred place of the Vaiṣṇavas. Sarayū or Sarabhū[6] of the Pali literature is the Ghagrā or the Gogrā in Oudh. According to the *Vividhatīrthakalpa*, the river Ghargharadaha meets with the Sarayū and is known by the name of Svargadvāra. This river rises in the mountains of Kumayun and after its junction with the Kālī-nadī, it is called the Sarayū, the Ghagrā or the Durā. According to

---

1 *Ayodhyā Mathurā Māyā Kāśī Kāñcī Avantikā, Purī Drārāvatī caiva Saptaitā mokṣadāyikāḥ.*

2 *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, vii, 3. 1 f.; *Śāṅkhāyana Srauta Sūtra*, XV. 17—25. Cf. *J.R.A.S.* 1917, p. 52 note.

3 & 4 *Vividhatīrthakalpa*, p. 24.

5 *Rāmāyaṇa, Bālakāṇḍa*, Ch. 24.

6 *Vinaya* II, 237; *Anguttara Nikāya*, IV. 101; *Saṃyutta* II. 135; *Udāna*, V. 5. The Aciravatī was its tributary.

the *Mahābhārata*,[7] the Sarayū issues from the Mānasa-sarovara. The Son and the Sarayū[8] joined the Ganges near Singhee, 8 miles east of Chapra in Saran, between Singhee and Harji-chupra, two villages on both sides of the Ganges, about 2 miles to the east of Cherund and 8 miles to the east of Chapra. According to Alberuni, Ayodhyā is situated about 150 miles south-east from Kanauj. In the Buddhist period, Kośala was divided into Uttara-Kośala (northern Kośala) and Dakṣiṇa-Kośala (southern Kośala), the Sarayū being the dividing line between the two provinces. The capital of the Southern Kośala was Ayodhyā on the Sarayū. According to the *Rāmāyaṇa*,[9] the river Syandikā or the Sai between the Gumti and the Ganges formed the southern boundary of Kośala.

Rhys Davids points out that Ayodhyā had sunk to the level of an unimportant town in Buddha's time.[10] Some think that Ayodhyā and Sāketa were identical but Rhys Davids says that both the cities existed in Buddha's time. They were possibly adjoining cities like London and Westminster. Ayodhyā seems to have been the earliest capital and Sāketa the next.[11] According to the Chinese pilgrim Yuan Chwang, it was 5000 li in circuit. The *Rāmāyaṇa* tells us that Rāmacandra walked south from Ayodhyā to Pañcavaṭī. After killing Rāvaṇa, Rāma is said to have proceeded to Kiṣkindhā and thence to

---

[7] *Anuśāsanaparva*, Ch. 155. The Sarayū is mentioned among other rivers:—*Rahasyāṃ Śatakumbhāñ ca Sarayūñ ca tathaiva ca Carmanvatiṃ Vetravatiṃ Hastisomāṃ diśam tathā* (Mbh., Baṅgavāsī Edn., p. 821, 19).

[8] Cf. *Rāmāyaṇa*, p. 47, vs. 3—5, where we read that Rāma visited the confluence of the Ganges and the Sarayū.

[9] I. Chs. 49-50.

[10] *Buddhist India*, p. 34.

[11] Rai Chaudhuri, *Political History of Ancient India* (4th Ed.), p. 91.

Ayodhyā [12] Ayodhyā is described in the *Rāmāyaṇa* as being situated on the banks of the river Sarayū in the land of Kośala which was a big *janapada* or country and the well-known town of Ayodhyā was included in it. Manu, the progenitor of man, is said to have built Ayodhyā which was 12 yojanas in extent and 3 yojanas in breadth. According to the *Rāmāyaṇa*, it took 4 days and nights to cover the distance between Ayodhyā and Videha at normal speed; swiftly moving envoys could cover the distance in 3 days. At a distance of one krośa (2 miles) from the capital city of Ayodhyā, was situated Nandigrāma where Bharata ruled over the people of Ayodhyā during Rāma's exile. The *Rāmāyaṇa* further points out that 3 days and 3 nights were generally taken for swiftly flying messengers to reach Mathurā from Ayodhyā. Rāma's palace was half a yojana distant from the banks of the Sarayū.[13]

Chinese pilgrims' accounts

The Chinese pilgrim, Fa-Hien, who visited Ayodhyā in the 5th century A.D., saw the Buddhists and the Brāhmaṇas not in good terms. He also saw a tope there where the four Buddhas walked and sat.[14] Another Chinese pilgrim, Yuan Chwang, who visited India in the 7th century A.D. after travelling more than 600 li and crossing the Ganges to the south, reached the Ayudhā or Ayodhyā country. According to him, Ayodhyā was the temporary residence of Asaṅga and Vasubandhu. He says that Ayudhā is Sāketa, *i.e.*, Ayodhyā. The country yielded good crops, was luxuriant in fruit and flower and had a genial climate. The people had agreeable ways, were fond of good work and devoted to practical learning. There were more than 100 Buddhist monasteries

---

[12] *Mahābhārata*, Baṅgavāsī Ed., 543, 52-70.

[13] *Rāmāyaṇa*, (Baṅgavāsī Ed.), p. 1466, 1.

[14] Legge, *Travels of Fa-Hien*, pp. 54-55.

and more than 3000 Brethren who were students of Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna. There were 10 deva temples and the non-Buddhists were few in number. Within the capital was the old monastery in which Vasubandhu composed various Śāstras. There was a hall in ruins where Vasubandhu explained Buddhism to princes and monks who used to come from other countries. Close to the Ganges was a large Buddhist monastery with an Aśoka tope to mark the place at which the Buddha preached to Devas and men for 3 months on the excellent doctrines of his religion. Four or five li west from this monastery was a Buddha relic tope and to the north of the tope were the remains of an old monastery where the *Sautrāntika-vibhāsā-śāstra* was composed. In a mango-grove 5 or 6 li to the south-west of the city was the old monastery in which Asaṅga learnt and taught. The three Buddhist treatises referred to by Yuan Chwang were communicated to Asaṅga by Maitreya, viz., *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra*, *Sūtrālaṅkāra-ṭīkā* and *Madhyanta-vibhāga śāstra*. About 100 paces to the north-west of the mango-grove was a Buddha relic tope. Asaṅga, according to the pilgrim, began his Buddhist religious career as a Mahīsāsaka and afterwards became a Mahāyānist. Vasubandhu began his career in the School of the Sarvāstivādins. The Chinese pilgrim also refers to an old monastery 40 li north-west from Asaṅga's chapel. Within this a brick-tope marked the place at which the conversion of Vasubandhu to Mahāyānism began. After the death of Asaṅga, Vasubandhu composed several treatises, expounding and defending Mahāyānism He died at Ayodhyā at the age of 83.[15]

Ajodhyā in the Epics

According to the *Rāmāyaṇa*, Ayodhyā was a city full

[15] Watters *on Yuan Chwang*, I, pp. 354—9.

of wealth and paddy. It had spacious streets and roads. Its streets were well-watered and looked gay with flowers. It had lofty gates furnished with doors and bolts amidst the net-work of its streets. Furnished with all kinds of equipments, it looked like a bulwork with its defences. It was the home of a large number of skilful persons trained in arts and crafts. It was full of palatial buildings, green bowers and mango-groves. Around all these, a long row of *śāla* trees looked like a girdle. The city was rendered impregnable being surrounded by a deep ditch filled with water. Animals useful to men like horses and elephants, cows, camels and asses could all be found there in large number. It had in it merchants from different countries, feudatory chiefs and princes from all quarters. Splendid with its stately mansions, it had a large number of pinnacled houses. The city had lofty seven storied buildings inlaid with gold and precious stones. It was a crowded city and frequently resounded by the drums and the notes of the harp and other musical instruments. It had a galaxy of great men, benevolent sages, and virtuous people. This blissful city had Kamboja horses and mighty elephants. Men of rank could be found in the city moving in chariots, horses and elephants. The parks and pleasure-gardens were resorts of lovers, where merry folk used to gather in the evening[16] In the *Mahābhārata*, the city of Ayodhyā is given the epithet of '*puṇyalakshaṇā*,' that is, endowed with auspicious signs. It was a delightful spot on earth and its sparkling splendour looked like the shining moon in autumn.[17]

Social History

According to the *Rāmāyaṇa* there were four grades of social order, *e.g.*, the Brāhmaṇas, the Kṣatriyas, the

---

[16] *Rāmāyaṇa*, p. 309, vv. 22—24.

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 6, vv. 90—98.

Vaiśyas and the Śūdras. They had to fulfil duties and obligations of the respective orders.[18] The Kṣatriyas obeyed the Brāhmaṇas, the Vaiśyas followed the Kṣatriyas, and the Śūdras served the three upper castes.[19] The Kṣatriyas like the Brāhmaṇas had to perform the worship thrice daily. The Brāhmaṇas occupied the most exalted position in the social order of the age. Being placed at the highest rung of the ladder, the special privileges that were denied to the Kṣatriyas, were however enjoyed by them. Thus the Brāhmaṇas alone had the right to master the four Vedas and used the sacred sound *Oṅkāra* and *Vaṣaṭkāra*.[20] The Brāhmaṇas had also the right to study not merely the sacred scriptures meant for their own class but also to acquire the sciences and arts intended for the Kṣatriyas.[21]

Ordinarily birth in a family determined once for all the caste of a man. Transgression of this rule was, however, allowed in special cases. Thus the sage Viśvāmitra, a Kṣatriya by birth, became a Brāhmaṇa(?) by dint of his extraordinary merit and was accepted in the rank of a Brāhmaṇa by his great rival Vaśiṣṭha.[22] The instance of Aśmaka, a royal sage, born from the union of sage Vaśiṣṭha with a Kṣatriya queen of the Ikṣvāku ruler of Ayodhyā, as related in the *Mahābhārata*, shows that offsprings born of such *asavarṇa* union were not unknown.[23] In the code of Manu we find mention of such *asavarṇa* marriages of the *anuloma* and *pratiloma* types.

The Brāhmaṇas were exempted from capital punishment.[24] The robbing of their property was con-

---

[18] *Rāmāyaṇa*, p. 114, v. 23.
[19] *Mbh*. 171-72, 23—47.
[20] *Ibid.*, pp. 15-16, vv. 16—19.
[21] *Ibid.*, p. 114, v. 23.
[22] *Rāmāyaṇa*, p. 114, v. 27.
[23] *Mbh.*, 171-72, 23—47.
[24] *Rāmāyaṇa*, 1391, v. 34.

sidered to be a heinous act according to the public opinion of the time.[25] They lived on vegetable diet.[26]

Famine was rare in the city of Ayodhyā. The people were free from diseases. Premature death was unknown. Everyone was charitably disposed and all residents whether male or female used ornaments. Malpractices were unknown and people were faithful in the observance of sacrificial rites.[27] People were loyal, faithful, and hospitable to their guests. They used to enjoy a long lease of life with their wives, sons and grandsons. The sick and the destitute were treated to sumptuous dinner. Food and dress were freely given to all during the sacrifice. Walking in circle around a dignified person before parting was the common way of paying homage.[28] In a *śraddha* ceremony a large number of cows, gold and other riches were given to the Brāhmaṇas.[29] Extortion was utterly unknown.[30] During the coronation ceremony, the streets were richly decorated and illuminated,[31] musical instruments were played and the Brāhmaṇas used to chant sweet benedictions. The coronation ceremony was held in an auspicious hour with good stars on a favourable day. Thus Rāma was installed as king by the family priest Vaśiṣṭha and others on a suitable day with the favourable star *Śravaṇa*.[32]

Various evil-killing rites were performed.[33] To follow elder brothers was the golden rule for the younger

---

[25] *Ibid.*, p. 1392, vv. 48-49.
[26] *Ibid.*, pp. 1404-5, vv. 26-27.
[27] *Ibid.*, p. 15, vv. 10—12.
[28] *Ibid.*, p. 115, v. 39.
[29] *Ibid.*, p. 126, vv. 21—25.
[30] *Ibid.*, p. 136, v. 24.
[31] *Ibid.*, p. 150, vv. 17-18.
[32] *Mbh.*, 543, .52—70.
[33] *Rāmāyaṇa*, p. 208, vs. 46-47.

brothers.[34] Earning money by selling lac, flesh, honey, iron or poison was considered abominable.[35] The offering of oblations in honour of the departed spirit was a common custom,[36] and the offering of watery oblations in honour of the departed ancestors was prevalent.[37] Jealousy among rival brothers was not unknown. It was a common-place occurrence that a wife should cling to her beloved, a friend should act in a like manner. For a brother to stick to his brother and act in a reciprocal way was something uncommon.[38]

Devotion to husband was considered as the highest virtue for married women.[39] According to the orthodox ideal of the age, the amorous look from other's eyes, the faintest touch from a member of the opposite sex other than her husband would have a sinister influence on the good reputation of a chaste wife.[40]

No act of violence should be committed on the weak and the helpless and specially on women. Such unchivalrous conduct looked like an act of cowardice. Stealing others' wives by treachery was an offence.[41] Respectable ladies never exposed themselves to public view. Seclusion of women within the confines of the inner apartment was the usual rule. If necessity arose, they would move in palanquins or some other covered vehicles with adequate veils over their faces and requisite garments over their bodies. On no ordinary account could they come out to public streets by crossing the city gates on foot

---

[34] *Ibid.*, p. 240, 6.
[35] *Ibid.*, p. 320, v. 38.
[36] *Ibid.*, p. 322, vv. 2-3.
[37] *Rāmāyaṇa*, p. 372, vs. 26-27.
[38] *Ibid.*, p. 1158, v. 14.
[39] *Ibid.*, p. 205, vs. 25-26.
[40] *Ibid.*, p. 1196, vs. 19-20; p. 1198, vs. 26-27.
[41] *Ibid.*, p. 1165, vs. 12-13.

or move with an open countenance.[12] The exit of women before the public view was allowed for serving the needs of different kinds of *Vyasanas* like hunting, game of dice, etc. In times of war or public sacrifice on the occasion of the marriage ceremony or during the work of choosing one's partner from among a large number of suitors in an open assembly (*Svayamvara*) or in times of great distress or sorrow women had the right to come out of their harem and expose themselves to public view. The use of deformed men and women for the work of the harem was in vogue at the time of the *Rāmāyaṇa*.[43] The life of widow seems to be the worst lot, the highest curse for a woman.[44]

There were expert barbers, as well as good musicians and well-trained courtesans, big merchants and traders at Ayodhyā.[45] Disrespect to Brāhmaṇas, parents and priests was considered to be a sacrilege.[46] Preservation of dead bodies in vessels filled with oil was then known.[47] King Daśaratha's dead body was preserved for sometime before its actual cremation by Bharata.[48]

Religious History

At the time of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the people and the members of the royal household were on the whole religious. Religious sacrifices were performed and Vedic mantras were chanted. During the horse sacrifice of King Daśaratha, twenty-one kinds of sacrificial wood were prepared and set up by expert craftsmen; of these six were made of the timber of the *Bilva* tree, six of *Khadira*

---

[42] *Ibid.*, p. 1185, v. 61; p. 1194, vs. 14-15.
[43] *Ibid.*, p. 181, vs. 1—3.
[44] *Ibid.*, p. 1309, vs. 42-43.
[45] *Ibid.*, p. 1220, vs. 3—5.
[46] *Ibid.*, p, 1267, v. 21.
[47] *Ibid.*, p. 1419, v. 3.
[48] *Ibid.*, p. 322, v. 4.

wood, six of *Palāśa* plant, one of the *Śleṣmātaka*[49] timber and the remaining two of pine wood. The sacrificial wood was covered with cloth and gold and worshipped with scented flowers. In a sacrifice many cows and a large number of gold and silver bits were given to the priests.[50] On the banks of the Sarayū, Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa offered their morning prayers and repeated the Sāvitrī mantra at the instance of the sage Viśvāmitra.[51] In the hermitage of Viśvāmitra, they performed the usual *sandhyā* and morning prayers and offered oblations to the sacrificial fire.[52] As we have already pointed out, offering of oblations in honour of the departed spirit was the common practice. The Kṣatriya kings and princes used to observe ten days of *aśauca* or the observance of impurity caused by the death of relations.[53] Among the Brāhmaṇas, sophists were not unknown and followers of the hedonist school of Cārvāka were also found. Four hundred horse sacrifices, four thousand *Vājapeya* and numerous *Gomedha*, *Agniṣṭoma* and *Atirātra* sacrifices[54] were performed by some eminent kings of the Ikṣvāku race. Duly bathed, a Kṣatriya king used to offer oblations to fire, and make worship in adoration of his ancestors and Brāhmaṇas and then pray before the images in temples inside his palace. As regards religious rights the Śūdras remained on a low footing of inequality in comparison

[49] *Cordia obliqua-Cordia Myx Linn Willd*. A tree or shrub in all provinces, whole of warmer parts of India; a pretty large but low tree in most parts of Circars, but chiefly in gardens and hedges and near villages in Gujarat, North Kanara, Deccan, Western Ghats, etc. There are two varieties, viz., *Kshudra Śleṣmātaka=Cordia obliqua* and *Śleṣmātaka* or *Cordia Wallichü*. When ripe the fruits of this plant are eaten by the people of the locality.

[50] *Rāmāyaṇa*, p. 31, vv. 50-51.

[51] *Ibid.*, p. 47, vv. 3-5.

[52] *Ibid.*, p. 58, vv. 31-32; *ibid.*, p. 59, v. 2.

[53] *Ibid.*, p. 323, vv. 1-2.

[54] *Ibid.*, p. 1452, vv. 8-9.

with the Brāhmanas and Kṣatriyas. Śambuka, a Śūdra by birth, was slaiṇ by Rāma for making vedic sacrifices.[55]

Jainism

In the history of Jainism, we find that a Jaina tīrthaṅkara named Ajitanātha was born at Ayodhyā. He earned the title of the "Victorious" for he was so devout an ascetic that he was unrivalled in performing austerities. He soon attained salvation.[56] A Jaina monk named Buddhakīrti waṣ well versed in Jaina scriptures. He flourished during the interval between Pārśvanātha and Mahāvīra. Once while performing austerities on the banks of the Sarayū in Palāśanagara he saw a dead fish floating. He carefully watched it and thought that there was no harm in eating the flesh of the dead fish for there was no soul in it.[57]

Lord Ādiguru attained enlightenment on the Aṣṭāvata mountain near Ayodhyā. Twenty-four Jain images were established on this mountain. Dovinda Sūri while wandering at Serisaya took his bath in the Sarayū river according to the *Vividhatīrthakalpa*. At the instance of the Goddess Padmāvatī a blind artisan was employed to make an image of Pārśvanātha. Three great images were brought from Ayodhyā by air.

Buddhism

Ayodhyā was hallowed by the dust of the feet of Gautama Buddha who lived there on the banks of the Sarayū. While he was there, he pointed out to the bhikkhus, the transitoriness of the human body. He told them thus, "The human body is like a foam, and similarly consciousness, glamour, and human activities, etc.,

55 *Ibid.*, p. 1420, vv. 3-4.
56 S. Stevenson, *Heart of Jainism*, p. 51.
57 *Ibid.*, p. 50

have no essence at all.''[58] The inhabitants of Ayodhyā saw the Buddha entering their town accompanied by a large number of bhikkhus. They built a monastery for him in a dense forest at a curve of the river Ganges and presented it to him. He dwelt there for sometime.[59]

Political History

The *Rāmāyaṇa* refers to the kings of Ayodhyā and the system of administration prevalent there. It is interesting to note here the duties of an Ikṣvāku king. Aroused from his sleep at dawn by the hymns of prisoners and *sūtas*, a king was served with water for washing hands and feet. Duly bathed a Kṣatriya king offered oblations to fire and prayed before the images in temples inside his palace. After finishing the morning duties he used to attend to the business of his state and then go to his court where he would meet his ministers. The king with his ministers used to listen personally to the prayers and complaints of his subjects.[60] Worthy treatment was given to state guests including kings and princes.[61] The king used to spend the first half of each day in doing the business of his state and the latter half of his time was spent in enjoying the company of the ladies of his harem.[62]

The chief aim of a righteous monarch was to earn the loyalty and goodwill of his subjects.[63] He used to hear the report of his trusted servants and reliable courtiers in order to ascertain the public opinion about his government.[64] He used to redress the grievances of his

[58] *Samyutta Nikāya*, III, 140 ff.

[59] *Sāratthapakāsinī*, II, p. 320.

[60] *Rāmāyaṇa*, pp. 1354-55, vv. 9—24 and 1.

[61] *Ibid.*, p. 1356, vs. 5 & 11.

[62] *Ibid.*, p. 1363, v. 27.

[63] *Ibid.*, p. 1367, vs. 14-15.

[64] *Ibid.*, p. 1364, vs. 5—7.

subjects as far as possible.[65] Nobody was detained or kept waiting at his door if he came to pray for something before the king.[66] He was assisted in his administration by able ministers, eminent jurists and men well-versed in the sacred lore. Punishment was always in proportion to the nature and gravity of the offence.[67] Life-long exile or transportation was an alternative for death sentence.[68]

The king used to give private interviews to spies and special messengers for confidential talks. Divulging state-secrets, watching or overhearing such secret talks were highly punishable.[69] The succession to the throne was generally determined according to the law of primogeniture in the Ikṣvāku family.[70]

Rāma's youngest brother Śatrughna ruled Mathurā which he founded.[71] His younger brother, Bharata, with his two sons Takṣa and Puṣkala conquered the Gandhāra country. The cities of Takṣaśīlā and Puṣkalāvatī were ruled by the two sons of Bharata.[72] Candrakānta and Aṅgadīyā were ruled by the two sons of Lakṣaṇa named Candraketu and Aṅgada.[73] Kuśa and Lava were rulers of southern and northern Kośala respectively.[74] Śatrughna, Rāma's younger brother, installed his two sons Suvāhu and Śatrughātī as kings of Mathurā and Vaideśa kingdoms respectively.[75]

---

65 *Ibid.*, pp. 1379-80.
66 *Ibid.*, pp. 1382-83.
67 *Ibid.*, p. 1391, vs. 32-33.
68 *Ibid.*, p. 1461, v. 13.
69 *Ibid.*, p. 1457, vs. 11-12.
70 *Ibid.*, p. 387, v. 36.
71 *Ibid.*, p. 1412, vs. 8-9.
72 *Ibid.*, p. 1455, v. 11.
73 *Ibid.*, p. 1456, vs. 7—9.
74 *Ibid.*, p. 1462, v. 17.
75 *Ibid.*, p. 1463, 10.

In the *Mahābhārata*,[76] the mention is made of sixteen celebrated kings (ṣoḍaśa-rājikā) some of whom belonged to Ayodhyā, namely, Māndhātṛ, Sagara, Bhagīratha, Ambarīṣa, Dilīpa[77] and Rāma Dāśarathi. In the *Mahābhārata* mention is also made of Ikṣvāku, Kakutstha, Yuvanāśva, Raghu, Nimi and others.[78] The pious Dīrghayajña was the king of Ayodhyā when Yudhiṣṭhira ruled and performed his Rājasūya sacrifice.[79] Divākara was a king of Ayodhyā who was the contemporary of Senājit, king of Magadha. Both of them were contemporaries of Asīmakṛṣṇa.[80] Ikṣvāku, one of the nine sons of Manu Vaivasvata[81] reigned at Ayodhyā who had two sons, Vikukṣi-śaśāda and Nimi. From the former was descended the great Aikṣvāku dynasty of Ayodhyā generally known as the solar race.

The Ikṣvākus, Aikṣvākus or Aikṣvākas are the titles of the solar race. Ikṣvāku was so called because he was born from the sneeze of Manu.[82] The Purāṇas give a list of the kings of Ayodhyā.[83]

The *Rāmāyaṇa* genealogy, according to Pargiter, must be treated as erroneous and the Pauranic genealogy is to be accepted.[84] The Purāṇas say that there were two Dilīpas, one father of Bhagīratha and the other father or grandfather of Raghu, but according to the *Rāmāyāṇa*, there was only one Dilīpa, father of Bhagīratha

[76] vii, 55, 2170; xii, 29, 910—1037; i, 1, 223-4.

[77] Dilīpa II.

[78] *Mahābhārata*, 13, 227—34.

[79] *Ibid.*, 241, 2.

[80] *Vāyu*, 99, 270 and *Matsya*, 50, 77.

[81] *Vāyu*, 85, 3-4; *Br*. 7. 1-2; *Ag*. 272, 5—7, 18—39; *Bḍ*. iii, 60, 2-3; *Kūr*, i, 20, 4—6; *Vā*, 64, 29-30; *Bḍ*.. ii, 38, 30—2.

[82] *Viṣṇupurāṇa*, Wilson's Trans. III, 259.

[83] *Vāyu*, 88, 8—213; *Brahmāṇḍa*, 7, 44—8, 94, Hv. 11, 660; 832; *Matsya*, 12, 25—57; *Pad*. v. 8, 130—62; *Kūr*, I, 20, 10—21, 60; *Viṣṇu* IV, 2, 3, 4, 49.

[84] *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition*, pp. 92 ff.

and great-grandfather of Raghu. According to the *Rāmāyaṇa*, Raghu was the father of Kalmāṣapāda and Aja is placed twelve generations below Raghu but the Purāṇas make Aja son of Raghu. The *Raghuvaṃśa*[85] supports the Purāṇas that Aja was the son of Raghu. The *Rāmāyaṇa* makes Kakutstha son of Bhagīratha and grandson of Dilīpa but the Purāṇas say that he was the son of Śaśāda. The *Mahābhārata* supports the Purāṇas.[86] The *Raghuvaṃśa*[87] also supports the Purāṇas in saying that from his time the kings had borne the title of Kākutstha and that Dilīpa was his descendant.

From Daśaratha to Ahīnagu there is general agreement. After Ahīnagu, most of the Purāṇas give a list of some twenty kings Pāripātra to Bṛhadbala agreeing in their names though some of the lists are incomplete towards the end.[88]

The Aikṣvāku genealogy of Ayodhyā mentions the following kings:—(1) Prasenajit who was the contemporary of Matināra; (2) Yuvanāśva II, Māndhātṛ who married Śaśabindu's daughter named Bindumati Citrarathī, (3) Purukutsa and (4) Trasadasyu.

Jahnu of Kānyakubja married the grand-daughter of Yauvanāśva, that is, Māndhātṛ.[89]

The Tālajaṅghas attacked Ayodhyā and drove the king Bāhu from the throne. Māndhātṛ of Ayodhyā had a long war with the Druhyu king Aruddha or Aṅgāra[90] and killed him.[91]

---

85 V, 35-6.

86 *Mahābhārata*, iii, 201, 13515-16.

87 VI, 71-4.

88 *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition*, p. 94.

89 *Vāyu*, 91, 58-9. *Bd*. iii, 66, 28-9. *Harivaṃśa*, 27, 1421—3; 32, 1761-62; *Brahmāṇḍa*, 10, 19-20, 13, 87.

90 *Harivaṃśa*, 32, 1837-38. *Br*. 13, 149-50. *Mbh*. xii, 29, 981-2.

91 *Ibid*., iii, 126, 10465.

Subāhu, son of the Cedi king Vīrabāhu and Ṛtuparṇa, king of Ayodhyā, were contemporaries.[92] Jamadagni allied himself with the royal house of Ayodhyā for he married Reṇukā, daughter of Reṇu.[93]

Sumitrā was the last of the Ikṣvāku kings in the Kali age who was contemporary with the Buddha. The royal house of Ikṣvāku sank into oblivion at the time of this king.[94]

The kings of Ayodhyā were connected with the Vaśiṣṭha family. The Vaśiṣṭhas were their hereditary priests.[95] The earliest Vaśiṣṭha was the famous priest of Ayodhyā in the reigns of Trayyāruṇa, Satyavrata-Triśaṅku and Hariścandra.[96] The next great Vaśiṣṭha was the priest of Ayodhyā in the time of Hariścandra's successor Bāhu who was driven from his throne by the Haihaya-Tālajaṅghas aided by the Śakas, Kāmbojas, Yavanas, Pāradas and Pahlavas from the north-west but Vaśiṣṭha maintained his position.

Mitrasaha Kalmāṣapāda Saudāsa, king of Ayodhyā, had the fourth noted Vaśiṣṭha as his priest. The fifth was priest to Dilīpa II Khatvāṅga and the sixth was priest to Daśaratha and his son Rāma. King Kalmāṣapāda Saudāsa beguiled by a Rākṣasa offered Vaśiṣṭha human flesh as food and was cursed by him.

Ikṣvāku obtained Madhyadeśa[97] and was the progenitor of the solar race,[98] with its capital at Ayodhyā.

---

[92] *Ibid.*, iii, 64, 2531, 65, 2576; *Vā*, 88, 174; *Bd.* iii, 63, 173; *Br.*, 8, 80; *HV.*, 15, 815.

[93] *Pad*, VI, 268, 8, 73-74; 269, 158.

[94] *Cambridge History of India*, Vol. I, p. 309.

[95] *Bḍ.* iii, 48, 29; *Viṣ.*, iv, 3. 18. *Pad.*, vi, 219, 44.

[96] Pargiter, *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition*, p. 205.

[97] *Br.*, 7, 20.. *HV.*, 10634.; *Siv.*, vii, 60, 17; *Vā.*, 85, 21.

[98] *Matsya*, 12. 15; *Pad.*, v, 8. 120.

The kingdom of Ayodhyā rose to very great eminence under Yuvanāśva II[99] and especially his son Māndhātṛ The latter married Śaśabindu's daughter Bindumatī. He was a very famous king, a Cakravartin and a Samrāj and extended his sway very widely [100] Māndhātṛ or his sons carried their arms south to the river Narmadā. The supremacy of Ayodhyā waned and the Kānyakubja kingdom rose into prominence under its king Jahnu. The Haihayas overcame Ayodhyā. The foreign tribes settled there after Ayodhyā was conquered.

Ayodhyā rose to prominence again under Amśumant's second successor Bhagīratha and Bhagīratha's third successor Ambarīṣa Nābhāgi.[101]

Of the Mānva or solar kingdoms that existed originally three remained, those of Ayodhyā, Videha and Vaiśālī.[102] These three Mānva kingdoms were not dominated by the Aila stock. The earliest Āṅgirasas were connected with Māndhātṛ, king of Ayodhyā, and the eariliest Āṅgirasa Ṛsi was connected with Hariścandra, king of Ayodhyā.[103]

Daśaratha called in the help of the rustic Ṛṣyaśṛṅga from Aṅga.[104] The eastern and southern kings and kings of the distant Punjab were invited to Daśaratha's sacrifice at Ayodhyā. Ayodhyā and the Vaśiṣṭhas had no association then with the brahmanically *elite* region as Pargiter points out.[105] The *Kathāsaritsāgara* refers to the camp of Nanda in Ayodhyā.[106]

---

99 *Mahābhārata*, iii, 126.

100 *Ibid.*, iii, 126, 10462.

101 *Br.*, 78, 55—77; *Pad.*, vi, 22, 7—18; *Lg.*, i, 66, 21-2; *Vā*, 88, 171-2.

102 *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition*, p. 292.

103 *Ibid.*, p. 304.

104 *Rāmāyaṇa*, i, 9 and 10.

105 *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition*, p. 314.

106 Tawney's Ed., I, p. 37.

In Buddhism we find that there was a king of Ayodhyā named Kāḷasena whose city was surrounded by ten sons of Andhakaveṇhu (Andhakaveṇhudāsaputtā dasabhātikā) who uprooted the trees, pulled down the wall, captured the king and brought his kingdom under their sway.[107] The city of Ayujjha was governed by the descendants of king Arindama.[108]

In Jainism we find that Prasannajita, a king of Ayodhyā, give his daughter named Prabhāvatī in marriage to Pārśvanātha.[109]

Ayodhyā seems to have been included within the kingdom of Puṣyamitra Suṅga. An inscription found at Ayodhyā mentions the fact that Puṣyamitra performed two horse-sacrifices or *aśvamedhas* during his reign.[110] According to a spurious Gayā plate, Ayodhyā was the seat of a Gupta *jayaskandhāvāra* or 'Camp of victory,' as early as the time of Samudra Gupta. Some coins of Pura Gupta have on the reverse the legend, "*Śrī Vikramaḥ*," which may be a shorter form of the full title '*Vikramāditya*'. Allan identifies [111] him with king Vikramāditya of Ayodhyā, father of Bālāditya, who was a patron of Buddhism through the influence of Vasubandhu. It may be assumed on the basis of this identification that the immediate successors of Skanda Gupta had a capital at Ayodhyā probably till the rise of the Maukharis.[112]

---

107 *Jātaka* (Fausböll), IV, pp. 82-83.

108 *Vaṃsatthapakāsinī* (PTS), Vol. I, p. 127.

109 S. Stevenson, *Heart of Jainism*, p. 48.; C. J. Shah (*Jainism in North India*, p. 83) considers this to be a misconception.

110 *E. I.*, Vol. XX, p. 57.

111 Cf. *B. M. C.*, Gupta Coins, p. cxxii.

112 Rai Chaudhuri, *Political History of Ancient India*, 4th Ed., pp. 495-496.

Ayodhyā Coins

A large number of coins were found on the site of Ayodhyā. These coins fall under three classes.[113] The first and the earliest consists of a few rare cast pieces, of which three types are known. The first type is known from one piece only;[114] it has a flower on the obverse and a plain reverse, and may not be a coin at all, but an ornament. Type II is only known from a unique specimen in the Museum,[115] the obverse type is a *svastika* which connects it with type III, and the symbol on the reverse is well known from several series of punch-marked coins. The square coin published by H. Rivett-Carnac,[116] (obverse *svastika*, rev. *bull*) is probably also a coin of this series. Type III is the commonest of this class: the obverse, a *svastika* over a fish, is connected by the former symbol with the preceding type; the roughness of the casting makes it difficult to break up the reverse type into its component symbols. These coins probably contain a crescent or a taurine symbol above a steelyard, but might be a taurine symbol over an axe. The former is the more probable explanation, and the occurrence of the steelyard suggests that these are local coins of the city, as distinct from the dynastic issues; they may be compared with the Taxila pieces bearing a steelyard. Their date may be conjectured to be the third century B.C.

The remaining coins of Ayodhyā are inscribed with the names of the rulers who issued them, and fall under two very distinct classes, issued by two separate dynasties, one of square cast coins showing no trace of foreign influence in their style and types, and another of round struck pieces which have types rather than symbols. The coins

---

113 Cf. H. Rivett-Carnac, *J.A.S.B.*, 1880, p. 138.

114 Pl. XVI. 6.

115 Pl. XVI, 7.

116 *J.A.S.B.*, 1880, Pl. XVII.

of the rulers of the first dynasty closely resemble one another in style and are connected by their types. The obverse is a bull, or rarely an elephant, before an elaborate symbol not always distinct, which is replaced on the coins of the later dynasty by a ceremonial standard or spear. The reverse type consists of a group of five or six symbols. The characteristic symbols are a small 'Ujjain' symbol, a tree in railing, a group of four *nandipadas* in a square, *a svastika*, a river or snake and another symbol. Two rulers, Viśākhadeva and Śivadatta, have also the type of *the abhiṣeka* of Lakṣmī. The names of six rulers of this dynasty are known from their coins, which bear simply the Prākrit form of the name in the genitive. They are Mūladeva, (*Mūladevasa*), Vāyudeva (*Vāyudevasa*), Viśākhadeva (*Viśākhadevasa*), Dhanadeva (*Dhanadevasa*), Śivadatta (*Śivadatasa*) and Naradatta (*Naradatasa*). At least one other ruler is represented by the uncertain coins on which the name is possibly Pāthadeva. The type of Viśākhadeva coin first published by Rivett-Carnac and now in the Indian Museum, has on the reverse a buckler-like object, a solar symbol with a central boss surrounded by a circle of dots within rims. This came from Fyzabad, as did all the coins published by Rivett-Carnac. No attempt to arrange these rulers in chronological order is possible, nor have we any literary or inscriptional references to them. They probably cover the second century B.C.

The third class of coins belongs to a later dynasty. From Rivett-Carnac and Cunningham we know that these come from the same site. They are round pieces struck from dies leaving the seal-like impression characteristic of early Indian struck coin, and very distinct from the coins of the earlier dynasty. The usual types are obverse: a bull before a standard or spear, which closely resembles the ceremonial spear on the Aśvamedha coins of Samudra

Gupta,[117] and reverse a bird, usually called a cock but probably a *haṃsa*, and a palm-tree with a river (or less probably a snake) below. These three elements are to be regarded as separate symbols and not as being combined to form a single type, as their proportions show. Another but rarer reverse type is an elaborate *nandipada* in a framework; the complete form of this type is probably something like the large symbol found on the coins of Almora. This occurs on the coins of Kumudasena, Ajavarman, Saṃghamitra and Vijayamitra. Vijayamitra is the only ruler who coins both types. On the coins of Kumudasena and Ajavarman, the object in front of the bull is probably a form of that on the coins of the earlier dynasty, a kind of triangular standard with cross-bar in railing. Kumudasena[118] is the only member of the dynasty to call himself rājā; the others inscribe their coins with their names only. The rulers represented in the British Museum are Satyamitra (*Satyamitasa*), Āryamitra (*Ayyamitasa*), Samgha (*Mitra*), Vijaymitra (*Vijayamitasa*), Kumudasena (*Rājña Kumudasenasa*) to which may be added from the Indian Museum collection the names of Ajavarman (*Ajavarmaṇa*) and Devamitra (*Devamitasa*).[119] None of these rulers is otherwise known to history. Their reigns probably covered the first two centuries A.D.[120]

---

117 Cf. *B.M.C.*, *Gupta Coins*, Pl. V. 9.

118 See Rapson in *J.R.A.S.*, 1903. p. 287.

119 Cf. *Catalogue of Coins in the Indian Museum*, i, pp. 150-51, No. 16, Pl. XIX. 16 and 18.

120 Allan, *Catalogue of the Coins of Ancient India*, Introduction, pp. lxxxvii—xc and 129—139.

[illegible] a bird, usually called a [illegible]
[illegible] a branch, and a palm tree with a [illegible]
[illegible] These three symbols are to be
regarded as separate symbols and not as being connected to
form a single [illegible]

[illegible]

UDAYOTTUṄGA

By K. R. PISHAROTI

UDAYOTTUṄGA, the author of the *Kaumudi*[1] on the *Locana* of Abhinavaguptapādācārya, is also the author of a love-lyric, called *Mayūra-sandeśa*.[2] He is one of the most eminent of our *Ālaṅkārikas* and at the same time the least known; and a note on this author in the light of the information available from the published portions of his works and from other sources cannot but be interesting to students of literary criticism particularly.

The late Prof. S. K. Sastri, M.A., I.E.S., has assumed that the name of the author of K-L is Uttuṅgodaya.[3] Presumably, the name appears to be Udayottuṅga. In the first place, Uttuṅga is found used as a titular name elsewhere also.[4] In the second place, *Udaya*, epigraphical evidence shows, is found used by certain families as a surname, indicative of their lineage from, or close association with, the ancient *Ceras*. Thirdly, there are vestiges of the family name of *Udaya* still persisting in the names of certain towns and villages in the locality.[5] And lastly, the expression *uttuṅgādudayakṣamābhṛtaḥ* could

[1] The first sixty-four pages of the text of *KU* has been published as the first *fascicule* by the late Prof. Mm. S. K. Sastry, and this, indeed, shows the extraordinary scholarship and erudition of the author.

[2] Extracts from *MS*. have lately been published by Dr. C. K. Raja in MW. of the 13th June and then again of the 29th August 1943.

[3] *Vide* introduction to the edition of K-L. This view is presumably supported by Dr. Raja also in the two contributions, mentioned in note 2 *ante*.

[4] Compare the name, for instance, Kulottuṅga Cola, 1072—1118 A.D.

[5] *Vide* paragraph following the next.

well mean the *Udaya* king, named Uttuṅga. These would show that the name of the author was Uttuṅga, and *not* Udaya, and that he belonged to the *Udaya* royal family.

This *Udaya* royal family, *alias*, *Villārvaṭṭam-svarūpam*, had their headquarters at Udayampērūr, about six miles to the east of Trippunithura, which, in church history, is famous for the synod of diamper under Archbishop Menezes towards the close of the sixteenth century.[6] The family traces its descent from *Śrī Kaṇṭha*,[7] a mythical ancestor, and presumably who was *Sāmanta*, i.e., non-Kṣatriya, by caste. The territories, over which the family held sway, extended roughly from Udayanāpuram, near Vaikham, in the south to about Crānganore in the north. It lay westwards of the *Kurū-svarūpam* towards the backwaters and comprised the whole of the sea-board *minus* the territories which belonged to the chief of Iṭappilly and the Kaimals, together known as the Añjikaimals, and it included among others the following places Cembil, Kumblam, Panannat, Elankunnapula, Cennamangalam, etc.[8]

Some of the place names are interesting and may be noticed in this connection : Udayanāpuram is Udayanapuram, the town of Udayana, *i.e.*, the Udaya chief.

---

[6] *Vide H-C.*

[7] In *MS.* the author styles himself as *Śrīkaṇṭharāja* : *vide* article cited in note 2 *ante*. It deserves to be pointed out that, as our tradition would have it, the author and the Sandeśakāra are identical and, therefore, Śrī Kaṇṭha who sends the message of love must be identical with Udayottuṅga, the poet. Hence, we believe Srī Kaṇṭha is the titular name of Uttuṅga, a name derived from that of the mythical ancestor of the royal family in which he was born. This name is but unknown to us : compare for instance—

śrīkaṇṭhavaṃśakalaśāmbudhipūrṇacandraḥ.

[8] This is the information supplied by my friend and collaborator, Mr. A. G. Warrier, Superintendent, Secretariat, Ernakulam in summary form.

Udayam-perūr is Udayana-perūr, *i.e.*, the great town of the Udayana king, presumably the capital. Udayattum-vātukkal, *alias* Udayottuṅga-vatukkal,[9] is the seat of Udayottuṅga. Again, Udayottuṅga figures in the name of a local temple of learning—*Udayatuṅgeśvarapaṇḍita-sabhāmaṭham*[10] which is more correctly *Udayottuṅgeśvara-paṇḍitasabhāmaṭham;* and, if the name is any indication, this centre of Śāstric studies must have been at least actively patronised by Udayottuṅga.[11] The vestiges, still persisting in the names of towns and villages in the area between Vaikham and Trippunithura, would indicate that the Udaya royal family, *alias* the Villārvattamsvarūpam, had their headquarters somewhere in this area.

The last chieftain of this royal family resigned his titles and privileges in favour of the royal family of Cochin, whose feudatory he was, and the circumstances which led to this incident are found narrated in a family chronicle, some leaves of which alone are now available.[12] The chief of Parūr, another feudatory of Cochin, insulted the chief of Villārvattam; and the latter, himself unable to demand compensation, went to his overlord, the king of Cochin, adopted him as his *anantaravan*, i.e., heir and successor, and requested him to avenge the insult done to

---

9 The term—*vātukkal*—means seat or residence; and hence the term means the residence of Udayottuṅga.

10 The funds of this temple of learning have been utilised for founding the Sanskrit college at Trippunithura, over which the present writer had the honour to preside for six years from 1923–29.

11 We say *patronised*-guardedly. For, according to a tradition current amongst us, this was a very old centre of learning and was once presided over by Prabhākara, the founder of the Guru school of *Mīmāṁsā*. Udayottuṅga possibly extended the scope of its activities and made it function better by increasing the funds at its disposal. *Vide* the writer's paper *Sanskrit Studies in Cochin*, contributed to *PC*.

12 Unfortunately, it was a very damaged copy, and, what was worse, the pages were deranged.

himself and his family. The forces of Cochin marched against the arrogant Parūr chief, and in a short time defeated him utterly.[13] This event should have taken place towards the close of the fifteenth century, and this is suggested by an incident recorded by the Portuguese. In the year 1510 A.D. one Thommaraja, a Christian approached the Portuguese, represented himself as the lineal descendant of the Villārvaṭṭamsvarūpam and hence the heir and successor to the family estates and titles,[14] and requested them to reinstate him on his ancestral throne which had been taken over by the king of Cochin. This representation did not produce any result,[15] but the date given indicates the period of the merging of the Villārvaṭṭam-svarūpam in the royal house of Cochin: it must have taken place sometime towards the close of the fifteenth century. When the tradition mentioned in the family chronicle is read along with the incident reported by the Portuguese, we get to know the circumstances which led to the merging of the family: *firstly*, the conversion of the heir-presumptive into an alien faith; and *secondly* the chief's incapacity to avenge the insult offered to him and

---

13 *Prima facie*, the incident narrated here seems to have taken plare in 647 M.E. that is, 1472 A.D. It may, however, be mentioned that this dating is not inconsistent with the date advanced on other bases.

14 This would evidently mean that the last chief who made over the titles to Cochin must have been deceased by the time.

15 Thommaraja, the Christian pretender to the titles of *Villārvaṭṭamsvarūpam*, was encouraged to do so, because the Portuguese were also Christians and were interesting themselves in the welfare of that community, but more because they had great influence over the King of Cochin. Again, just about this time there was discord in the Cochin royal family also over the question of succession: (*vide* the *Cochin State Manual*). Certainly, if the pretender had any right, the Portuguese would have championed his cause, for that would have meant a Christian kingdom under their thumb. And this, therefore, is an indication that Thommaraja had by his apostacy forfeited his claims to the throne.

the family by the chief of Parūr.[16] Naturally, therefore, the last chief of the family adopted the king of Cochin as the successor to his family titles and privileges, the bulk of the landed properties being handed over to his children, from whom is said to have descended the present Pāliyam family.[17]

We know that Udayottuṅga, the author of *K-L.* and *MS.* must have been alive sometime about 1480 A.D. as his reference to Uddaṇḍa clearly indicates.[18] And, since the Svarūpam became merged in the Cochin royal family before 1510 A.D., we may conclude with a fair degree of certainty that it was this prince himself who handed over the family titles to Cochin. Himself not being a warrior, he could not avenge the insult done to him; nor could he prevent his *anantaravan* from becoming a convert to Christianity. Hence, Uddayottuṅga handed over his family titles to the king of Cochin and devoted himself to the gentler arts of peace—to poetry and literary criticism and to the organisation, rather development, of the temple of learning at Kumblam, known as *Udayatuṅgeśvara-paṇḍitasabhāmaṭham*. This, then, gives the date of the author of *K-L* : he must have been living in the last quarter of the fifteenth century and must have died before 1510 A.D.,[19] and this dating is borne out by the reference to Uddaṇḍa.

The identity of the author of *K-L* and *MS.* and his contact with Uddaṇḍa explains Udayottuṅga's sending a

---

16 Presumably, this had something to do with the conversion of the heir.

17 This also explains the close relationship existing between the Pāliyam family and the Cochin Royal Family even unto this day. In olden days, the head of the family was the prime minister of the Maharaja of Cochin.

18 *Cf. VGC.* Chapter III.

19 *Vide* note 14 *ante*. This is the date of Thommaraja's representation to the Portuguese.

message of love and hope to a heroine, belonging to the house of Taccapalli in Annakara-deśam, near Kunnakulam,[20] and Uddaṇḍa's sending a similar message to a heroine at Cennamangalam, the southern headquarters of Villārvaṭṭam chief.[21] During this period and for sometime later, Porkkalam, near Kunnakulam, was a sacred shrine for all orthodox scholars, for there lived the famous Payyūr Bhaṭṭatiris—over a dozen in number—and all alike distinguished scholars and poets, the foremost amongst whom were Maharṣi and his son Parameśvara, known also as *Mīmāṁsā-cakravartī* who has left his name behind him in a series of original contributions in the field of Mīmāṁsā-śāstra.[22] Uttuṅga, himself being a scholar, was naturally drawn to this Bhāṭṭa-mana, where he came into contact with the great scholar-poet Uddaṇḍa. There the chief must have married a woman of the place, probably the daughter of the local chief, Kaṇḍan-kota, and to her he later sends a message of love in his *MS*. Cennamangalam was the southern headquarters of the Villārvaṭṭam chief, and Uddaṇḍa must have often visited that place at the invitation of Uttuṅga, and so he sends a message of love to a woman there in his KS.[23] These two *Sandeśas* together complete a geographical survey of Kerala from Kolattiri in the north to Trivandrum in the south. The heroine of MS. was Uma *alias* Māracemanti,[24] a daughter of Kaṇḍan-kota of Cittañjursvarūpam.[25] She

---

[20] Vide the first paper of Dr. Raja, quoted in note 2 *ante*.

[21] This is the theme of the well-known KS. of Uddaṇḍa, published by the Mangalodayam Company, Trichur. A short notice of this work is set forth by the writer in his VGC, that is being serially published in the *BSRVRI*, Trichur, *vide* Chapter III.

[22] The subject is elaborated in *VGC*, mentioned in note *ante*.

[23] As a matter of fact Uddaṇḍa's contact with Cennamangalam was a topic difficult to expla :ni *vide VGC* cited in note 20 *ante*.

[24] Vide citation in note 14 *ante*.

[25] So far as we know there seems to be no justification for

must have been a well-known figure of the day, for she appears again as the heroine of the earliest Malayalam kāvya, *CU* a work which has to be assigned to the latter half of the fifteenth century, as internal evidence shows.[26]

To conclude: the author of *K-L* and *MS* must have lived in the latter half of the fifteenth century, married Umā *alias* Māracemanti, daughter of Kaṇḍan-kota of Cittañjūrsvarūpam, handed over his titles and privileges to the king of Cochin towards the close of the century and devoted himself to the arts of peace, to literature and literary criticism and to the extension of the *Paṇḍita-sabhā* at Kumblam.[27]

The writer here permits himself to indulge in a little speculation. The most important work on the rhetoric of Malayalam language is *LT*. We have elsewhere shown that the author of this work must have lived after 1401 A.D., possibly in the latter half of the century.[28] The erudition, versatality and critical acumen which characterise *LT*. are of the same order of merit as is seen in the K-L. May we not, therefore, identify the author of *K-L* with the author of *LT*? This is tempting enough,[29] but at present it is a mere speculation to be accepted or rejected in the light of a comparative study, when the full text of *K-L*. and *MS*. are rendered available.

---

assuming that Uma *alias* Maracemanti was the wife of Kaṇḍan-kota, chief of Cittañjūr. The expression, *śrīkaṇṭhorvīpatibahumatam* as well means the daughter of the chief, and this probably was one reason why Udayottuṅga married her. Simirarly, Dr. Raja's citation of a parallel from *US*, serves no useful purpose in the context, since there also Uṇṇinili was only the daughter of the chief of Vatakkankūr and not his wife. And note this *Sandeśa* does not say that she was the consort of Kaṇḍan-kota.

26 The subject is set forth in some detail in *VGC*, already cited in note 20 *ante*.

27 *Vide* the writer's paper on Sanskrit Studies in Cochin, *vide PC*.

28 This is set forth in the writer's paper on *LT*., *vide* note 43, which is being published in the current number of *BSRVI*.

29 *Vide* the writer's paper on LT. cited in the last note.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. *Uṇṇinīlisandeśa* (US).
2. *Kaumudī* on *Locana* (KL).
3. *Kokila-sandeśa* (KS).
4. *Candrotsava* (CU).
5. *Mayūrasandeśa* (MS).
6. *Mātṛbhūmi Weekly* (MW).
7. *Līlātilaka* (LT).
8. *Progress of Cochin* (PC).
9. *Vikrama the Great of Calicut* (VGC).
10. *Bulletin of the Sir Rama Varma Research Institute* (*BSRVRI*).
11. Hough: *Christianity*.

RESEARCH IN INDIAN PHILOSOPHY : A REVIEW

By P. T. RAJU

(*Continued from page* 364)

It is maintained by some that the doctrine of Emergent Evolution is to be found in Indian Philosophy, particularly in the Sāṅkhya. One writer thinks that *tattvāntarapariṇāma* is emergent evolution. The reader is staggered. If the writer is questioned he might begin drawing distinctions and concludes that the western conception of emergent evolution, if it is to be perfect, ought to be *tattvāntarapariṇāma*. But we are concerned not with what emergent evolution *ought to be* for the west but with what it *is* in the west. Lloyd Morgan is the first philosophical exponent of the view. Indeed, Alexander, Hobhouse and some others used the idea earlier, but the first to use the term as a label for his philosophy is Lloyd Morgan. Later also other formulations of the theory sprang up. One important point we should not forget is that Emergent Evolution is a philosophy of the naturalists, that is, those who maintain a scientific attitude in philosophy or who do not leave the level of the natural sciences and uphold naturalism in one form or another. But it is doubtful whether 'naturalism' can be applied to the Sāṅkhya at all. As naturalists these philosophers maintain that life and mind emerge out of matter or, to use a more exact term, supervene upon matter. Thus emergence does not mean that they remain submerged for a long time and then later come to the surface, but that they are qualities which certain configurations of matter obtain. They are not substantives : they are not *sat* before they emerge. Unlike the Sāṅkhya, these evolutionists do not accept the

satkāryavāda. W. M. Wheeler writes: " 'Emergence,' in the following pages, is neither the manifestation or unveiling of something hidden and already existing, as in the common and etymological denotations of the word, nor some miraculous change,—but a *novelty of behaviour* arising from the specific interaction or organisation of a number of elements, whether inorganic, organic, or mental, which thereby constitute the whole, as distinguished from their mere sum, or resultant."[16] One more important difference is this. Lloyd Morgan himself writes: "We are not to suppose that this means that the atom develops into a molecule, this into a plastidule (or whatever it may be called at the level of life), and so on."[17] That is, there is no change of the lower into the higher: the lower does not *become* the higher. There is no *pariṇāma* at all, either the *tattvāntarapariṇāma* or any other. But then what is it that happens? The author continues: "Each higher entity in the ascending series is an emergent 'complex' of many entities of lower grades, within which a new kind of relatedness gives integral unity. May one say that each higher com-*plex* takes on the rôle of a *com*-plex in virtue of its integral unity; and that the higher the status of any given entity along the line of advance, the more do both limbs of the compound word, and the concept it names, get the emphasis indicated by italics." Does the Sāṅkhya advocate anything similar? And if the Sāṅkhya doctrine of creation is a form of emergent evolution, why not treat the doctrine of *pañcīkaraṇa* as another, and so every theory of creation? Such comparisons and interpretations are of little value, and are positive hindrances to true understanding. They are superficial and depend merely upon

---

[16] Quoted in McDougall's *Modern Materialism and Emergent Evolution*, p. 233.

[17] *Emergent Evolution*, p. 11.

the etymological meaning of the word, and not upon a systematic understanding of the concept. The idea is detached from its context or universe of discourse, and most of its significance is lost. This universe of discourse is the philosophical outlook of naturalism, in which the concept grew and took form.

Another example of such work which probably does not go beyond labelling is the interpretation of the Advaita as Holism after the famous book, *Holism and Evolution*, of General Smuts. The only reason I can imagine for calling Śaṅkara's philosophy Holism is that his *Brahman* is *pūrṇa* or completely or whole. There is little else common between it and western Holism. Holism is a philosophy of evolution, according to which evolution tends to create more and more comprehensive wholes. Smuts writes in his preface: "An attempt is made to show that this whole-making or holistic tendency is fundamental in nature, that it has a well-marked ascertainable character, and that evolution is nothing but the gradual development and stratification of progressive series of wholes, stretching from the inorganic beginnings to the highest levels of spiritual creation." But does Śaṅkara's philosophy say anything about this tendency? Is it a philosophy of evolution at all? It is true that Hegel's all-comprehensive Absolute Idea is shown as being evolved out of the poorest category Being. Somewhat similar processes may be shown in the philosophies of Schelling and some others. But nothing similar can be shown in Śaṅkara's system. We do not advance one step in understanding it by comparing it to Holism.

A third example is the discovery of Hormism or Hormic psychology in the *Bhagavadgītā*, the Upaniṣads and so forth. Professor McDougall is the founder of the school of Hormic Psychology, and it arose

as a protest against understanding mind as a static structure. It maintains that mind is dynamic and that the distinctive mark of the mental is purposiveness. McDougall writes: "This book teaches, then, a frankly and thoroughly *purposive psychology*. Such psychology is distinctive only so far as other schools neglect, ignore, or deny this most fundamental peculiarity of all our activities, their purposiveness. As soon as (and the date cannot be so far distant) all psychologists recognise this peculiarity, *purposive psychology* must lose its distinctiveness and becomes merely *psychology* . . ."[18] As a matter of fact Indian psychology or philosophy says nothing at all about the methods of interpreting mind. There is really no need to introduce a concept like the Horme, and its introduction cannot but lead to confusion and misunderstanding. Even when we have to deal with instincts—and McDougall's psychology is famous for its treatment of instincts—we may simply call them as such without bringing in the idea of the Horme. The difference between structuralism, mechanism, epiphenomenomilasm, etc., has not been made by Indian psychology. When once we call a particular doctrine Hormic Psychology, we have then to waste much of our energy to find out in vain the corresponding details, and then misunderstand and mislead. Indeed Indian philosophy has no separate psychology even. There are certain psychological discussions interspersed with metaphysics, logic, ethics, rhetoric, etc. Even as a philosophical system Hormism cannot be found in Indian Philosophy. For universal hormism would mean that our universe exhibits purposiveness. But to attribute such a doctrine to Indian Philosophy would amount to nothing less than deliberate misunderstanding. All Indian systems, whether monistic or dualistic, preach the realisation of the Brahman as

[18] *The Energies of Men*, p. 23.

the highest in life. But that can hardly be called Hormism.

A fourth example is the contention that the *Gītā* preaches axiology or axiological idealism. Axiology is the theory of value. But it would be too much to say that the *Gītā* has a theory of value on the ground that Lord Kṛṣṇa, when asked by Arjuna how he is to think of him, says that he is the best of every thing.[19] Practically all schools of Indian Philosophy present some ideal of life, which they identify with the Brahman. But that is not a theory of value except in a very remote sense, in which case every religion must be called axiology as it exhorts us to strive after some ideal. Unless it is a systematically developed theory of value it is a misnomer to call it axiology. Some Indian systems may be called axiological idealism, when they identify reality and value. According to axiological idealism, reality is beyond sense and is the same as value. Urban, the greatest metaphysician of value who ever wrote in English, says: "The ultimate inseparability of value and reality is now almost axiomatic; to attempt to divorce them can issue only in unintelligibility."[20] As a matter of fact not even Śaṅkara says that what he calls Reality is value. But we can see through his writings and point out that he does mean their identity. And the position of the *Bhagavadgītā* may be called axiological idealism, only if it supports Śaṇkara's Advaita, but not merely on the ground of Kṛṣṇa's utterances.

It may perhaps be questioned whether it would be possible at all to interpret our theories if we are not to give them any names. Certainly, we have to call them by some names, not necessarily the names of theories

[1] *Gītā*, X, 19 foll.

[20] Urban: *The Intelligible World, Preface.*

which are the latest developments in the west. Progress in Indian philosophical research does not consist in the progressive branding of the same old theories with the names of the western doctrines which are being formulated from day to day. Our philosophy is ancient and mainly concerned with ontology. Modern scientific theories and outlook could not have influenced it. The philosophical reaction which we find in the west to such theories and outlook, and which took the form of the philosophies of evolution, axiology, phenomenology, etc., etc., cannot naturally be found in it. We cannot be too cautious in our selection of terminology for interpreting our philosophy.

There is a method of interpretation, which, though more serious, necessarily leads to wrong evaluations. It is based upon the philological study of terms and a genetic study of concepts. Undoubtedly such studies are useful in understanding the growth of connotations. Yet to insist that the origin of the concept invariably determines the significance of the system is one of the greatest philosophical blunders. If, for instance, *ātman* originally meant breath as in the German root *atmen*, should we therefore compare Indian Philosophy, for which *ātman* is the highest spiritual principle, to the philosophy of Anaximenes, according to which air is the principle of the universe, and call it hylozoism or materialism? Again, as the word *jīva* comes from the root *jī* (to live), should we say that Indian thought has not reached beyond the biological conception of soul? These interpretations are fantastic, though scholarly; and to them the answer is that words as signs are mobile and transfer themselves not only from one physical object to another, but also from a physical to a mental. Betty Heimann's *Indian and Western Philosophy*, which has already been referred to, is full of such interpretations. She writes: "I studied

the classics. . . . from the linguistic standpoint, and this procedure ultimately developed into a philosophical method ultimately associated with the psychological aspect of philology.''[21] This is her standpoint. And her conclusion is that Indian Philosophy is transcendental materialism.[22] "For while genuine materialism conceives the world as one unrepeated formation India, on the other hand, rises above single empirical observations and postulates the transformation of one empirical form into another, and finally of all these into a static shapelessness which is beyond all empirical experience; and this, once again, precludes the identification of India's Ontology with Realism.''[23] It is very difficult to discuss her arguments in a short compass but a few may be mentioned and quoted. "This doctrine of Maya, however, even in its negative formulation by Buddhistic-Vedantic sects, is not akin to any Western idealistic system. For in the first place no superiority of any spiritual discriminative principle is recognised; on the contrary, it is the supremacy of the materialistic, the chaotic principle that is implied; it is eternal Matter that is asserted, and into this each single form in the end is reabsorbed.''[24] Is this the reason for identifying Indian thought with transcendental materialism? Does any system of Indian philosophy treat Māyā as the highest principle? Even admitting the Sāṅkhya, for argument's sake, as the fundamental system as Heimann would have it,[25] does it not have a discriminative principle besides matter? Further, "in Indian doctrine no merely spiritual principle

---

[21] *Indian and Western Philosophy*, p. 13.

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 61.

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 53.

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 48.

[25] *Ibid.*, p. 39.

can ever be supreme. From the very beginning, on the contrary, the second eternal principle of Matter is on an equal footing with Spirit or Mind." "In India, it must be observed, the first and last principle is not regarded as being fundamentally different from perennial Matter; it is neither primeval consciousness, nor is it a purely spiritual principle; rather it is Matter itself in its chaotic stage or indefinite fulness or immeasurable emptiness, together with the original urge towards self-manifestation."[26] If these statements are true, then Indian thought is transcendental materialism; it has not been able to rise from the material to the spiritual level. It understands spirit, probably, as rarefied matter, obeying all material laws. Is not the law of *karma* an inexorable material law attributed to spirit? Is not thereby spirit conceived in the likeness of matter? "This Atman (the vital essence in man) is the same in the ant; the same in the gnat, the same in the elephant, the same in the three worlds, . . . the same in the whole universe." So Indian thought could not rise above a biological conception! "*Nāma-rūpa* therefore means that objects can be comprehended by means of the name, the logical magical aspect, or the *rūpa*, the visible shape, the first principle being based on the presupposition *namen et omen*, that is to say, words are *satya*, Reality, and *akṣara*, constant, inviolable entities; for India's magical positivism assumes that an object name is the key to its very essence, while the second possible approach to things is through *rūpa*, visible form." Do all the Indian systems believe that name is the essence of things? Child and Folk Psychologies tell us that for both children and primitive people names are the things or at least adjectives or properties of things. But as mind develops

---

[26] *Ibid.*, pp. 56-7.

both in the race and in the child the word and the object get detached from each other, though the tendency remains for the word to come up whenever the object is thought of. But is the doctrine of the *akṣara brahman* or the *śabdabrahman* (the Brahman as sound) based upon an ill-development of Indian mind and the consequent inability to distinguish between the word and the object? Buddhism calls objects *nāma-rūpa*, but is it because of its primitive and crude logic? Should we not say that Dr. Heimann's conclusions themselves are really due to her identifing name and thing? What else can a philological approach to philosophy mean?

The truth is there that in the mental development of the race and the individual the word is identified with the thing at first. That is why some of the earliest philosophical attempts both in the East and the West are characterised by intense philological activity. Even Greek philosophy before Plato is not exempted from it. It was thought that the nature of things could be determined by the etymological study of their names. Plato had to discuss this question in his *Cratylus*. Zeller writes: "It was of the greatest consequence to the Ideal philosophy to ascertain what worth attached to words, and how far a true imitation of things might be recognised in them. His (Plato's) ultimate conclusion, however, is only this, that Philosophy must go her own way independently of Philology."[27] Are not the interpreters of Indian Philosophy to take advice from Plato? Systematic study, systematic comparison, not only of one concept with, and to another but also of one system as such with, and to another system as such, must supersede philological interpretation.

---

[27] *Plato and the Older Academy*, p. 212.

VII

The true aim of research, in Indian Philosophy, even of the ancient, is not realised only by translating and editing the texts. The aim should at least be the creation of the appreciation of our outlook, and that cannot be achieved only by translation. Nay, the aim should be wider and higher, the laying bare of the logical structure of our thought and making possible further developments, so that we can contribute to the progress of world's philosophy. Editing and translation is not a very important part of research so far as Indian Philosophy as philosophy is concerned. It need not be undertaken by professor of the Philosophy Departments of our universities. It is as much a work of the Sanskritists, and so can be safely entrusted to members of the Sanskrit Departments. Even the work of tanslation can, to a large extent, be done by them. Where the work is fairly technical, collaboration between the Sanskrit and the Philosophy Departments would produce better results. Or it should be taken up by one who is qualified in both. Simple expositions can be given by the Sanskritists themselves now and then taking the help of a man of philosophy. But where systematic interpretation and comparison are involved, one who is only a Sanskritist can do little. Real philosophical work begins here. It is said that Sir Ganganatha Jha used to declare that a professor of philosophy in any Indian university could do nothing unless he knew Indian Philosophy. And the work has so far progressed now that none can do important work in Indian Philosophy unless one has a strong grounding in European Philosophy. The progress of Indian Philosophy depends in future on the number of important works that come from the hands of such workers and the use that is made of them in further developments. Otherwise, Indian

Philosophy will continue to be treated as an antiquarian subject and will be studied as Buddhist remains are studied. India's philosophers will no longer make any contribution to the future progress of world's philosophy.[28]

---

[28] With this idea in mind, which I discussed at length, I contributed the Chapter on "Indian Philosophy: A Survey" to the *Progress of Indic Studies*, and gave a bibliography. A reviewer mentioned that the bibliography contains a glaring omission of the Mīmāṁsā Texts published in Madras University Series, the Gaekwad Oriental Series, the Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series etc. The reviewer seems to have looked only into the section on Mīmāṁsā. Had he looked into the other sections also, he could have noticed that texts and translations were mostly excluded in the bibliography, except in the case of Buddhism, where after naming some Buddhist series, I tried to include as many of those which were not published in those series as seemed useful and important. I made the exception because many of the Buddhist works, particularly of the Mahayana, are not found in any of the Indian languages, dead or living. And even here we have very few original texts, but mostly translations. Now, to include all the texts of all the systems, sects and religions would require many more pages than the maximum twenty-four allotted to the chapter. Even if a little more space had been allowed, it would have been more profitably used in discussing the methods adopted of research than giving a list of the published texts which can be easily obtained from a catalogue of any oriental book company, and if still more space were given, for a philosophical evaluation of the works published on Indian Philosophy. The order of importance from the standpoint of philosophy would be: systematic presentations, evaluations and comparisons, then historical presentations, simple expositions, translations and then texts. The attitude of the reviewer may well be appreciated, as he is a pure Sanskritist. But so long as that attitude predominates and influences our research, we would be doing harm to our own philosophy, which will not cease to be of mere antiquarian interest. A new attitude is badly now in need, as philosophical activity in our country has become stagnant. The new attitude should view Indian Philosophy as the philosophy of the Indians, both ancient and modern. The aim of Indian philosophical research ought to be higher than the publication of texts and translations, which naturally characterise only the early stages of the work. Unfortunately what I pleaded for in the work mentioned seemed to have made no impression on the reviewer. I make this reference only as an example of the general attitude that still prevails to Indian philosophy.

VIII

Classifying Indian Philosophy according to religion, that is, according to whether it is Hindu, Buddhist or Jaina, we find that till now much work has been done in Hindu and Buddhist philosophy, but not in the Jaina. It is not meant that many Jaina original works have not been published. The Jaina community in India is the richest, and many texts have been printed and published. But we do not find so much philosophical interpretation of Jainism as of Hinduism and Buddhism.

The original texts of Indian Philosophy are not divided into metaphysics, ethics, logic, psychology, etc., as the works of European Philosophy are. We indeed find a few on logic and epistemology, but the other branches are intermixed. Modern philosophical research is trying to separate them. Many books have been written on metaphysics and religion. We have till now only two important works on logic, namely, Vidyabhushan's and Stcherbatsky's. There are some translations of *Tarkasangraha* with introductions and notes containing comparative expositions of the Nyaya syllogism. But a comparative philosophical evaluation of Indian logic or Indian logical systems has not yet been attempted. Still less work has been done in psychology. Besides, J. N. Sinha's *Indian Psychology—Perception*, which contains much logical and epistemological material, we have Rhys Davids' *Buddhist Psychology* and Pathak's *Heyapaksha of Yoga or a Constructive Synthesis of Psychological Material in Indian Philosophy*. There are a few publications on yogic psychology by western writers. But we have even now to say that we do not know what Indian psychology of the ancient systems would be when all the material is put systematically together. Sir Radhakrishnan in his Foreword to the last work says: "Perhaps

a work which will integrate all material collected here into a systematic whole is yet to be written," and his observation holds true even now. The same or even worse is the situation in ethics. We have no ethical philosophies or systems, and no systematic exposition of our ethical outlook is yet attempted. Of the Western writers Hopkins is the most sympathetic. We have M.M. Kane's *magnum opus*, *History of the Dharmaśāstra*. In social and political philosophy some work has been done, particularly by Dr. Bhagavan Das and some few independent constructions are given by Dr. Vinayakumar Sircar. Many ethical and psychological expositions of the growth of caste have appeared. In aesthetics, education and other branches a little work has been done; but it is not philosophically of much importance.[29]

---

[29] In this paper I am not giving the names of the many great scholars and their works as I gave them elsewhere. See *Progress of Indic Studies*. To make the article complete, I am making some general remarks on the amount of work done in different branches of philosophy.

GLEANINGS FROM SOMADEVASŪRI'S YAŚASTILAKA CAMPU

By V. RAGHAVAN

(*Continued from p.* 380)

Part II.

Pp. 24-5: A lady door-keeper of the queen is described here as proficient in the knowledge of the language, appearance, dress, etc., of people of various countries.

P. 37:[12] A reference to a mechanical fan-arrangement near the bed of Amṛtamatimahādevī, consisting of an image of a woman which was mechanically waving a fan— उपान्तयन्त्रपुत्रिकोत्क्षिप्यमाणव्यजनपवनापनीयमानसुरतश्रमः ।

P. 54: With reference to the queen's misbehaviour with the servant in the elephant-stables, the king remarks bitterly about the depravity of women. Somadeva quotes here two bits:

स्त्रियः खलेषु रज्यन्ते दासहस्तिपकादिषु and अपात्रे रमते नारी ।

Of these the first quoted half-verse is found in Vātsyāyana as referring to Veśyās:

वेश्याः खलेषु रज्यन्ते दासहस्तिपकादिषु । II. 9.36.

P. 85: A minister named Vasuvarṣa and a minstrel named Subhāṣitavarṣa are introduced. It may be noted that the Varṣa-ending again is a Rāṣṭrakūṭa-characteristic. See my article on Somadeva in the *NIA*.

[12] P. 36: On this page appears a description *suggestive* of acts of sexual enjoyment; in this connection Śrīdeva says, and Śrutasāgara follows him, that Dhvani is an Alaṅkāra:

नखप्रदानालिंगनसंवेशनकणितकुचपरामर्शनताडनसुरतावसानानि निवेदितानि ध्वनेरलङ्कारस्याश्रयणात् । "अन्यार्थवाचकैः यत्र पदैरन्यार्थ उच्यते । सोऽलंकारो ध्वनिः ज्ञेयो वक्तुराशयसूचनात् ॥" Śrīdeva, p. 18*a*.

P. 88. Some proverbs :

i. स्वप्नेषु भक्तमुपलभ्य गोणिः (णिं) प्रसारयति ।

ii त्रियामायां मोदकमन्दमठिकावलोकनादामन्त्रितमहीपतेरुपाख्यानम्

which alludes to a popular illustrative story. Earlier, in Pt. 1, p. 428 we have four proverbs :

iii. कपाले भुञ्जानस्य हि नरस्य क इव केशदर्शनाद् आशप्रत्यादेशः ।

iv. पुरे प्रमोषदत्तस्य हि पुरुषस्य केव कान्तारेऽपेक्षा ।

v निरम्बरनितम्बायामात्माम्बायां दाहोद्योगस्य हि जनस्य क इव परम्बायामम्बर-परित्यागः ।

vi. स्थितासुं ग्रसमानस्य गतासौ कीदृशी दया । परबाले कृपा कैव स्वबालेन बलिक्रिये ।

P. 92 : 'न धर्मांश्चरेत् , एष्यतफलत्वात् संशयितत्वाच्च । को ह्यबालिशो हस्तगतं पादगतं कुर्यात् । वरमद्य कपोतः श्वो मयूरात् । वरं सांशयिकान्निष्कात् असांशयिकः कार्षापणः ।'

इति महान् खलु लोके लौकायतिकलोककोलाहलः ।

These seem to form part of the Sūtras of the Lokāyata system. For the same set of Sūtras, see Vātsyāyana's *Kāma sūtras* I. ii. 25-30.

P. 95 : Reference to the prevalence of some sinful practices in some countries as a result of the king's own example.

वङ्गीमण्डले नृपतिदोषाद् भूदेवेषु आसवोपयोगः ।
पारसीकेषु स्वसवित्रीसंयोगः,
सिंहलेषु च विश्वामित्रसृष्टिप्रयोग इति ।

Vaṅgīmaṇḍala is interpreted as Ratnapura by Śrutadeva; the same commentator calls Pārasīka, Rāś-vānadeśa; both he and Śrīdeva interpret Viśvāmitrasṛṣṭi as Varṇasaṅkara.

Kumārila also refers in his *Tantravārttika* to Brahman woman of Mathurā and Ahicchatra as addicted to drinking : अद्यत्वेऽप्यहिच्छत्रमथुरानिवासिब्राह्मणीनां सुरापानम् । p. 128 *edn. Chow.* 1903.

P. 98. Just as Varṇasaṅkara is called Viśvāmitra-sṛṣṭiprayoga, hunting is called Pāpardhi and meat, Rāvaṇaśāka.

P. 99. प्राणाघातान्निवृत्तिः a verse found in the *Nītiśataka* (śl. 54) of Bhartṛhari is quoted and ascribed to Vararuci.

On the same page a verse from a Purāṇa and one from Vyāsa (*Mahābhārata*) are quoted.

P. 100. A quotation from Vaivasvata Manu.

2. Verses are quoted from the *Arthaśāstra* of Bharadvāja, the section on Ṣāḍguṇyas. These verses are valuable as hitherto no actual quotations have been found from Bharadvāja, though references to his views are made by Kauṭalya.

अवक्षेपेन हि सतामसतां प्रग्रहेण च ।
तथा सत्त्वेष्वभिद्रोहादधर्मस्य च कारणात् ॥
विमाननाच्च मान्यानां विश्वस्तानां न घातनात् ।
प्रजानां जायते लोपो नृपतेश्चायुषः क्षयः ॥
कथमिदमभाषत षाड्गुण्यप्रस्तावे भारद्वाजः ।

In Kauṭalya VII. 5, the verses which give the conditions which create discontent among people seem to be based on the above verses of Bhāradvāja. The first line in Kauṭalya is identical with the first line quoted by Somadeva from Bhāradvāja, अवक्षेपेण etc; the other lines in Kauṭalya here have also parallels in the quotation made by Somadeva. Cf. उपघातैः प्रधानानां मान्यानां चावमाननैः

P. 100. Then is given a quotation from Viśālākṣa's *Arthaśāstra*, from the last section called Aupaniṣadika, stating that kings should announce the prohibition of animal slaughter on particular days:

चातुर्मास्येष्वर्धमासिकं, दर्शपूर्णमासयोश्चातूरात्रिकं, राजनक्षत्रे गुरुपर्वणि च त्रैरात्रिकं, एवमन्यासु चोपहतासु तिथिषु द्विरात्रमेकरात्रं वा सर्वेषामघातं घोषयेदायुर्बलवृद्ध्यर्थमिति कथमुपनिषदि वदति स्म विशालाक्षः ।

This view is not cited in the Aupaniṣadika section by Kauṭalya. Śrutasāgara who says here उपनिषदि वेदान्तशास्त्रे विशालाक्षः प्रभाकरऋषिः bungles hopelessly.

P. 101. Bāṇa is quoted; the passage refers to the unmeritorious food which hunters are accustomed to, and it occurs in the *Kādambarī* in the description of the hunters. *Kāvyamālā edn*. p. 63.

Pp. 101-3. प्रश्नोत्तरपरम्पराप्रवृत्तमुदन्तकार्षीत् and then follows a series of 7 Āryā verses, closely modelled on the *Praśnottararatnamālikā* ascribed to king Amoghavarṣa, A.D. 814-880, a Śvetāmbara Vimala and others.

Pp. 104-5. A sample of anti-jain declamation.

Pp. 110-1. Śruti and Smṛti are quoted.

Pp. 111-2. Jyotiṣāṅga is quoted; Sāṅkhya,[13] Yoga and Lokāyata as Ānvikṣikī are referred to. According to the reference here, Bṛhaspati's work on Philosophy (Ānvikṣikī) contains a reference to the text of Syādvāda of the Nagnaśramaṇaka.

सांख्यं योगो लोकायतं च आन्वीक्षिकी। तस्यां च 'स्यादस्ति स्यान्नास्तीति नग्नश्रमणकः' इति बृहस्पतिः आखण्डलस्य पुरः तं समयं कथं प्रत्यवतस्थे।

Yoga here is Nyāya.

P. 112. In these and other citations, Somadeva is canvassing references to Jainism in Brahminical books. The further citations are from:

1. Prajāpati's *Citrakarman*: प्रजापतिप्रोक्ते चित्रकर्मणि। The reference is to the painting of a Śramaṇa. This text may be the *Bhrāhmīya Citrakarma Śilpaśāstra* of which the Tanjore Ms. No. 15430 represents a fragment.

2. Ādityamata. This again is a Śilpa work, and the reference is to the making of God's images, according to the Jain conception. This text may be the *Bhānumata* in the Tanjore Library No. 15431, and the Madras Govt. Ori. Mss. Library, R. No. 5231.

3. A verse from the Pratiṣṭhākāṇḍa of Varāhamihira.

वराहमिहिरव्याहृते प्रतिष्ठाकाण्डे,—'विष्णोर्भागवताः etc.,

[13] Śrutasāgara's gloss सांख्यं उल्लूक्यदर्शनम्, सत्कार्यापरनामधेयम् is a mistake.

P. 113. 4. Nimittādhyāya (on Omens).

5. Poets: *Urva*, Bhāravi, Bhavabhūti, Bhartṛha Bhartṛmeṇṭha, *Kaṇṭha;* Guṇāḍhya, Vyāsa, Bhāsa, *Vo* Kālidāsa, Bāṇa, Mayūra, *Nārāyaṇa, Kumāra*, Māg and Rājaśekhara.

The italicised are rare names.

6. The Kāvya chapter of Bharata's *Nāṭya Śāstr*

Pp. 117-8 ff: References to objectionable Vidhis Brahminical practices.

P. 135: While the king is against doing an anim sacrifice as a propitiation against the evil dream he ha his mother advises him to do a sacrifice at least wit flour-made substitute foul,—Piṣṭakukkuṭa. In th connection, Somadeva's words, as interpreted by Śrut sāgara also, seem to imply the existence of texts uphol ing the equal or greater efficacy of Piṣṭapaśuyāga.

Text: परिश्रावितसकलसत्त्वोपहारफलोत्कटेन पिष्टकुक्कुटेन

Com: परिश्रावितं विविधग्रन्थप्रमाणपूर्वकम्

In the Mokṣadharma, Śāntiparvan, chs. 344- *Kumbhakonam edn.*, there is the story of Uparicara Vas doing a sacrifice with Piṣṭapaśu, and seeing God Himsel coming and taking such an offering; in ch. 345, th Ṛṣis, as against the Devas, are said to uphold the Piṣṭa paśu-view, as also the view that the Vedas contemplat grains and herbs as materials of offering.

P. 139: Reference to a legend of Vararuci carryin a pot of liquor on his head.

In this same context, Somadeva refers to the sin o adultery and the story of (king) Dāṇḍakya. The refer ence to this is found in Kauṭalya I. 5. 3, where the Bhoj king Dāṇḍakya, as a result of his desire for a Brāhma maiden, perished along with his whole family an kingdom.

Pp. 152-3: Instances of dangers to kings fron women: stories of Maṇikuṇḍalā and Ajarāja among th

Yavanas, Vasantamati and Suratavilāsa in the Śūrasenas, Vṛkodarī and Madārṇava of the Daśārṇas, Madirākṣī and Manmathavinoda of the Magadhas and Caṇḍarasā and Muṇḍīra of the Pāṇḍyas.

The whole passage occurs also in Somadeva's *Nītivākyāmṛta*.

P. 170 : समीच्तसिद्धान्त इव कपिलकुलकान्तः --a reference to the Sāmkhya. (Śrīdeva : समीच्ता सांख्यशास्त्रम्)

P. 194 : A reference to the *Raghuvaṁśa* of Kālidāsa starting with Māgadhī (Sudakṣiṇā).

P. 195 : Refers to Metrics, to Veda and Gāyatrī.

P. 196 : श्रकविलोकगणनमपि सकालिदासम् According to Śrīdeva, the word Kālidāsa means a Bhūta also. (कालिदासो भूतः p. 24a). According to Śrutasāgara's explanation of the Śleṣa here, Kālidāsa means Mango. On p. 309, the text refers to a Kālidāsa Kānana, a Kālidāsa-forest, where Śrīdeva interprets Kālidāsa as Bhūtas. (कालिदासा भूतपर्यायाः

P. 196 : Syādvāda and Vardhamāna.

P. 206 : *Mahābhārata*.

P. 214 : There is the expression सीकरासारतारकितहरिति सरिति which seems to echo Kulaśekhara's *Mukundamālā*—
च्तीरसागरतरंगशीकरासारतारकितचारुमूर्तये ।

P. 246 : The science of polity is described as 'नवभूमिका' 'नयनीतिरिव नवभूमिका'. Śrīdeva says here that three kinds of Naigama and six kinds of Vyavahāra make this number nine.

P. 246 : Reference to Bṛhaspati's Lokāyata which does not believe in Paraloka; Mīmāṁsā and Niyoga and Bhāvanā; the 3 Buddhistic Piṭakas and Yogācāra; Śrīdeva says here (p. 25*b*) :

योगाचारः ज्ञानाद्वैतवादी । योगः श्रात्मागतपदार्थयथात्मज्ञानाद् विद्धः सपरिस्पन्दः श्रात्मप्रदेशः । उपात्तागामिकर्मच्चयप्रतिबन्धहेतुराचारश्च ।'

P. 246 : Kucumāravidyā (Kucabhāra in the text is wrong). Śrīdeva says (p. 25*b*) कुचुमारः कुहकविद्योपाध्यायः and again elsewhere— कुचुमारः धूर्तशास्त्रप्रणेता ।

Kucumāravidyā is really the Aupaniṣadika part of the erotic lore which Kucumāra expounded. See Vātsyāyana I. i. 17.

P. 246: References to Citrabandhas in Mahākāvyas; Bharata, Laya and Nāṭya.

P. 247: पाण्ड्यमुद्रेव शकुलियुगलांकिता is a reference to Pāṇḍya coin having the emblem of two fishes.

Reference to a Pūrṇakumbha being a good omen.

The gain Samavasaraṇa.

Copyists and their habit of storing ink are referred to.

P. 249: The festival of Manmatha-worship and cock-fighting are introduced. A specialist in omens named Āsuri, a Bhāgavata, a Khanyavādin named Haraprabodha and a mendicant named Kharapaṭauṣadhabudha.

Khanyavāda is the divination of underground treasures. Kharapaṭa, according to the *Mattavilāsa-prahasana* of Mahendravikrama, is the promulgator of the Coraśāstra, art of theft. Śrīdeva says (p. 25b) खरपटं वकशास्त्रम्—the art of deceiving.

P. 250: Āsuri mentioned above is the name of a Sāṁkhya-ācārya. Through his mouth a brief exposition of Sāṁkhya is given here. The text एवमाह सूरि: refers to this Āsuri. The words here दुःखत्रयोपततप्तचेताः तद्विघातकहेतु जिज्ञासा etc., are echoes of the first Kārikā of Iśvara-Kṛṣṇa; the quotation with which the passage ends: तदा द्रष्टुः स्वरूपेऽवस्थानम्' is from *Pātañjala Yoga Sūtras*.

The Brāhman Dhūmadhvaja parodies this Sāṁkhya view.

P. 251: Haraprabodha who was introduced as a Khanyavādin, is, as his name also suggests, a follower of Śaivism. He now expounds Śaiva thought, the two paths, Dakṣiṇa for Bhukti and Vāma for Mukti and Bhukti. He reinforces his praise of the Vāmamārga by quoting a verse पेया सुरा प्रियतमामुखमीक्षणीयम् etc., which he ascribes

to Bhāsa. The verse is found in Mahendravikrama Pallava's *Mattavilāsaprahasana*.

Pp. 251-2: This the Buddhist Sugatakīrti ridicules and expounds the Nirvāṇa of his own school.

Pp. 252-3: This is followed by the views of Nīlapaṭa, *i.e.*, Cārvāka. The explanation of Caitanya appearing in the body on the analogy of the intoxicating power in some drinks and the absence of rebirth and Paraloka are mentioned.

P. 254: The Maṅgalaśloka of the *Ślokavārttika* of Kumārila is quoted with Kumārila's name.

Then follows the quotation:

कथं चेदं वचनमजर्यम्—

समस्तेषु वस्तुष्वनुस्यूतमेकं समस्तानि वस्तूनि यं न स्पृशन्ति।
वियद्वत्सदा शुद्धिमत् यत्स्वरूपं स सिद्धोपलब्धिः स नित्योऽहमात्मा॥

This is verse 11 of the *Hastāmalakīya*, of, one of the four pupils of Śaṅkara, Hastāmalaka, and on which a gloss is ascribed to Śaṅkara himself. A quotation from the *Hastāmalakīya* in a work of A.D. 959 is important.

Pp. 254-5: Śaiva tenets again.

The verse ऐश्वर्यमप्रतिहतं सहजो विरागः etc., is quoted here anonymously, and on p. 272, it is cited as a verse of Avadhūta.—इत्यवधूताभिधानं च घटेत। There is a Kashmīrian Śaiva writer named Avadhūtasiddha who has written a hymn on Śiva named *Bhagavadbhakti-stotra*. See Bühler's Report of a Tour in search of Skt. MSS. in Kashmir, etc., 1877. Extracts. p. clxii. No. 474. If he is the same as the Avadhūta who has commented on some works like the *Prabodhapañcadaśikā* of Abhinavagupta, he cannot be the Avadhūta quoted by Somadeva.

P. 285: The verse रथः क्षोणी यन्ता शतधृतिः etc., is quoted and the author is given as *Grahila*. इति च ग्रहिलभाषितम्। This is verse 18 of the *Śivamahimnasstava* of Puṣpadanta.

P. 256: A philosophical work named *Ratnaparīkṣā* is quoted.

P. 256: Two Subhāṣitas on Karma are quoted, of which the second नमस्यामो देवान् ननु हतविधेस्तेऽपि वशगाः etc., is verse 94 of Bhartṛhari's *Nītiśataka*, the first in the Karmapaddhati. It is also found as the opening verse of Śilhaṇa's *Śāntiśataka*, p. 278, z. Vidyasagar's *Kāvyasaṁgraha*, II.

P. 256-7: After a criticism of Śaivism, Buddhism is introduced.

The whole of the above noticed section contains many quotations from philosophical works of different schools.

P. 261: A series of verses in defence of Jain practices, ending with a line adopted from Kālidāsa's *Raghuvaṁśa*, I: प्रतिबध्नाति हि श्रेयः पूज्यपूजाव्यतिक्रमः ।

P. 267: Ch. 6. called Upāsakādhyayana.

P. 269. A summary of the schools—

1. Saiddhāntika Vaiśeṣikas (Śaivites.)

सकलनिष्कलाप्तप्राप्तमन्त्रतन्त्रापेक्षदीक्षालक्षणाद् श्रद्धामात्रानुसरणान्मोक्षः इति सैद्धान्तिकवैशेषिकाः ।

2. Tārkikavaiśeṣikas, the regular Vaiśeṣikas.

द्रव्यगुणकर्मसामान्यसमवायान्त्यविशेषाभावाभिधानानां पदार्थानां साधर्म्य-वैधर्म्यावबोधतन्त्राद् ज्ञानमात्रात् इति तार्किकवैशेषिकाः ।

Viśeṣa is more specifically stated as Antyaviśeṣa; Abhāva is included as a Padārtha.

3. Pāśupatas. त्रिकालभस्मोद्धूलनेज्यागड्डुकप्रदानप्रदक्षिणीकरणात्मविडम्बनादिक्रियाकाण्डमात्राधिष्ठानादनुष्ठानाद् (?) दिति पाशुपताः । See the *Pāśupata sūtras*, *TSS*. 143. I, 2: भस्मना त्रिषवणं शयीत I-8 हसितगीतनृत्तडुंडुंकारनमस्कारजप्योपहारेणोपतिष्ठेत् । Gaḍukapradāna in Somadeva is perhaps the Duṇḍakāra or offering of a sound of that form: डुंडुंकारो नाम य एष जिह्वाग्रतालुसंयोगान् निष्पद्यते पुण्यो वृषनादसदृशः सः Kauṇḍinya's *Bhāṣya*, *ibid*. The Ātmaviḍambana referred to by Somadeva is probably the giving themselves away of the Pāśupatas, behaving as they pleased or engaging themselves in such activities as are referred

P. 101. Bāṇa is quoted; the passage refers to the unmeritorious food which hunters are accustomed to, and it occurs in the *Kādambarī* in the description of the hunters. *Kāvyamālā edn.* p. 63.

Pp. 101-3. प्रश्नोत्तरपरम्पराप्रवृत्तमुदन्तकार्षीत् and then follows a series of 7 Āryā verses, closely modelled on the *Praśnottararatnamālikā* ascribed to king Amoghavarṣa, A.D. 814-880, a Śvetāmbara Vimala and others.

Pp. 104-5. A sample of anti-jain declamation.

Pp. 110-1. Śruti and Smṛti are quoted.

Pp. 111-2. Jyotiṣāṅga is quoted; Sāṅkhya,[13] Yoga and Lokāyata as Ānvikṣikī are referred to. According to the reference here, Bṛhaspati's work on Philosophy (Ānvikṣikī) contains a reference to the text of Syādvāda of the Nagnaśramaṇaka.

सांख्यं योगो लोकायतं च आन्वीक्षिकी। तस्यां च 'स्यादस्ति स्यान्नास्तीति नग्नश्रमणकः' इति बृहस्पतिः आखण्डलस्य पुरः तं समयं कथं प्रत्यवतस्थे।

Yoga here is Nyāya.

P. 112. In these and other citations, Somadeva is canvassing references to Jainism in Brahminical books. The further citations are from:

1. Prajāpati's *Citrakarman*: प्रजापतिप्रोक्त चित्रकर्मणि। The reference is to the painting of a Śramaṇa. This text may be the *Bhrāhmīya Citrakarma Śilpaśāstra* of which the Tanjore Ms. No. 15430 represents a fragment.

2. Ādityamata. This again is a Śilpa work, and the reference is to the making of God's images, according to the Jain conception. This text may be the *Bhānumata* in the Tanjore Library No. 15431, and the Madras Govt. Ori. Mss. Library, R. No. 5231.

3. A verse from the Pratiṣṭhākāṇḍa of Varāhamihira.

वराहमिहिरव्याहृते प्रतिष्ठाकाण्डे,—'विष्णोर्भागवताः etc.,

---

[13] Śrutasāgara's gloss सांख्यं उल्लूक्यदर्शनम्, सत्कार्यापरनामधेयम् is a mistake.

P. 113. 4. Nimittādhyāya (on Omens).

5. Poets: *Urva*, Bhāravi, Bhavabhūti, Bhartṛhari, Bhartṛmeṇṭha, *Kaṇṭha;* Guṇāḍhya, Vyāsa, Bhāsa, *Vosa*, Kālidāsa, Bāṇa, Mayūra, *Nārāyaṇa, Kumāra*, Māgha and Rājaśekhara.

The italicised are rare names.

6. The Kāvya chapter of Bharata's *Nāṭya Śāstra*.

Pp. 117-8 ff: References to objectionable Vidhis in Brahminical practices.

P. 135: While the king is against doing an animal sacrifice as a propitiation against the evil dream he had, his mother advises him to do a sacrifice at least with flour-made substitute foul,—Piṣṭakukkuṭa. In that connection, Somadeva's words, as interpreted by Śrutasāgara also, seem to imply the existence of texts upholding the equal or greater efficacy of Piṣṭapaśuyāga.

Text: परिश्रावितसकलसत्त्वोपहारफलोत्कटेन पिष्टकुक्कुटेन

Com: परिश्रावितं विविधग्रन्थप्रमाणपूर्वकम्

In the Mokṣadharma, Śāntiparvan, chs. 344-5, *Kumbhakonam edn.*, there is the story of Uparicara Vasu doing a sacrifice with Piṣṭapaśu, and seeing God Himself coming and taking such an offering; in ch. 345, the Ṛṣis, as against the Devas, are said to uphold the Piṣṭapaśu-view, as also the view that the Vedas contemplate grains and herbs as materials of offering.

P. 139: Reference to a legend of Vararuci carrying a pot of liquor on his head.

In this same context, Somadeva refers to the sin of adultery and the story of (king) Dāṇḍakya. The reference to this is found in Kauṭalya I. 5. 3, where the Bhoja king Dāṇḍakya, as a result of his desire for a Brāhman maiden, perished along with his whole family and kingdom.

Pp. 152-3: Instances of dangers to kings from women: stories of Maṇikuṇḍalā and Ajarāja among the

Yavanas, Vasantamati and Suratavilāsa in the Śūrasenas, Vṛkodarī and Madārṇava of the Daśārṇas, Madirākṣī and Manmathavinoda of the Magadhas and Caṇḍarasā and Muṇḍīra of the Pāṇḍyas.

The whole passage occurs also in Somadeva's *Nītivākyāmṛta*.

P. 170: समीक्षासिद्धान्त इव कपिलकुलकान्तः --a reference to the Sāmkhya. (Śrīdeva : समीक्षा सांख्यशास्त्रम्)

P. 194: A reference to the *Raghuvaṁśa* of Kālidāsa starting with Māgadhī (Sudakṣiṇā).

P. 195: Refers to Metrics, to Veda and Gāyatrī.

P. 196: अकविलोकगणनमपि सकालिदासम् According to Śrīdeva, the word Kālidāsa means a Bhūta also. (कालिदासो भूतः p. 24a). According to Śrutasāgara's explanation of the Śleṣa here, Kālidāsa means Mango. On p. 309, the text refers to a Kālidāsa Kānana, a Kālidāsa-forest, where Śrīdeva interprets Kālidāsa as Bhūtas. (कालिदासा भूतपर्यायाः

P. 196: Syādvāda and Vardhamāna.

P. 206: *Mahābhārata*.

P. 214: There is the expression सीकरासारतारकितहरिति सरिति which seems to echo Kulaśekhara's *Mukundamālā*—क्षीरसागरतरंगशीकरासारतारकितचारुमूर्तये ।

P. 246: The science of polity is described as 'नवभूमिका' 'नयनीतिरिव नवभूमिका'. Śrīdeva says here that three kinds of Naigama and six kinds of Vyavahāra make this number nine.

P. 246: Reference to Bṛhaspati's Lokāyata which does not believe in Paraloka; Mīmāṁsā and Niyoga and Bhāvanā; the 3 Buddhistic Piṭakas and Yogācāra; Śrīdeva says here (p. 25*b*):

योगाचारः ज्ञानाद्वैतवादी । योगः आत्मागतपदार्थयथात्मज्ञानाद् विद्धः सपरिस्पन्दः आत्मप्रदेशः । उपात्तागामिकर्मक्षयप्रतिबन्धहेतुराचारश्च ।'

P. 246: Kucumāravidyā (Kucabhāra in the text is wrong). Śrīdeva says (p. 25*b*) कुचुमारः कुहकविद्योपाध्यायः and again elsewhere— कुचुमारः धूर्तशास्त्रप्रणेता ।

Kucumāravidyā is really the Aupaniṣadika part of the erotic lore which Kucumāra expounded. See Vātsyāyana I. i. 17.

P. 246 : References to Citrabandhas in Mahākāvyas; Bharata, Laya and Nāṭya.

P. 247 : पाण्ड्यमुद्रेव शक्कुलियुगलांकिता is a reference to Pāṇḍya coin having the emblem of two fishes.

Reference to a Pūrṇakumbha being a good omen.

The gain Samavasaraṇa.

Copyists and their habit of storing ink are referred to.

P. 249 : The festival of Manmatha-worship and cock-fighting are introduced. A specialist in omens named Āsuri, a Bhāgavata, a Khanyavādin named Haraprabodha and a mendicant named Kharapaṭauṣadhabudha.

Khanyavāda is the divination of underground treasures. Kharapaṭa, according to the *Mattavilāsa-prahasana* of Mahendravikrama, is the promulgator of the Coraśāstra, art of theft. Śrīdeva says (p. 25b) खरपटं वकशास्त्रम्—the art of deceiving.

P. 250 : Āsuri mentioned above is the name of a Sāṁkhya-ācārya. Through his mouth a brief exposition of Sāṁkhya is given here. The text एवमाह सूरि : refers to this Āsuri. The words here दुःखत्रयोपतप्तचेताः तद्विघातकहेतु जिज्ञासा etc., are echoes of the first Kārikā of Iśvara-Kṛṣṇa; the quotation with which the passage ends: तदा द्रष्टुः स्वरूपेऽवस्थानम्' is from *Pātañjala Yoga Sūtras*.

The Brāhman Dhūmadhvaja parodies this Sāṁkhya view.

P. 251 : Haraprabodha who was introduced as a Khanyavādin, is, as his name also suggests, a follower of Śaivism. He now expounds Śaiva thought, the two paths, Dakṣiṇa for Bhukti and Vāma for Mukti and Bhukti. He reinforces his praise of the Vāmamārga by quoting a verse पेया सुरा प्रियतमामुखमीक्षणीयम् etc., which he ascribes

to Bhāsa. The verse is found in Mahendravikrama Pallava's *Mattavilāsaprahasana*.

Pp. 251-2: This the Buddhist Sugatakīrti ridicules and expounds the Nirvāṇa of his own school.

Pp. 252-3: This is followed by the views of Nīlapaṭa, *i.e.*, Cārvāka. The explanation of Caitanya appearing in the body on the analogy of the intoxicating power in some drinks and the absence of rebirth and Paraloka are mentioned.

P. 254: The Maṅgalaśloka of the *Ślokavārttika* of Kumārila is quoted with Kumārila's name.

Then follows the quotation:

कथं चेदं वचनमजर्यम्—

समस्तेषु वस्तुष्वनुस्यूतमेकं समस्तानि वस्तूनि यं न स्पृशन्ति ।
वियद्वत्सदा शुद्धिमत् यत्स्वरूपं स सिद्धोपलब्धिः स नित्योऽहमात्मा ॥

This is verse 11 of the *Hastāmalakīya*, of, one of the four pupils of Śaṅkara, Hastāmalaka, and on which a gloss is ascribed to Śaṅkara himself. A quotation from the *Hastāmalakīya* in a work of A.D. 959 is important.

Pp. 254-5: Śaiva tenets again.

The verse ऐश्वर्यमप्रतिहतं सहजो विरागः etc., is quoted here anonymously, and on p. 272, it is cited as a verse of Avadhūta.—इत्यवधूताभिधानं च घटेत । There is a Kashmīrian Śaiva writer named Avadhūtasiddha who has written a hymn on Śiva named *Bhagavadbhakti-stotra*. See Bühler's Report of a Tour in search of Skt. MSS. in Kashmir, etc., 1877. Extracts. p. clxii. No. 474. If he is the same as the Avadhūta who has commented on some works like the *Prabodhapañcadaśikā* of Abhinavagupta, he cannot be the Avadhūta quoted by Somadeva.

P. 285: The verse रथः क्षोणी यन्ता शतधृतिः etc., is quoted and the author is given as *Grahila*. इति च ग्रहिलभाषितम् । This is verse 18 of the *Śivamahimnasstava* of Puṣpadanta.

P. 256: A philosophical work named *Ratnaparīkṣā* is quoted.

P. 256 : Two Subhāṣitas on Karma are quoted, of which the second नमस्यामो देवान् ननु हतविधेस्तेऽपि वशगाः etc., is verse 94 of Bhartṛhari's *Nītiśataka*, the first in the Karmapaddhati. It is also found as the opening verse of Śilhaṇa's *Śāntiśataka*, p. 278, z. Vidyasagar's *Kāvyasaṁgraha*, II.

P. 256-7 : After a criticism of Śaivism, Buddhism is introduced.

The whole of the above noticed section contains many quotations from philosophical works of different schools.

P. 261 : A series of verses in defence of Jain practices, ending with a line adopted from Kālidāsa's *Raghuvaṁśa*, I : प्रतिबध्नाति हि श्रेयः पूज्यपूजाव्यतिक्रमः ।

P. 267 : Ch. 6. called Upāsakādhyayana.

P. 269. A summary of the schools—

1. Saiddhāntika Vaiśeṣikas (Śaivites.)

सकलनिष्कलाप्तप्राप्तमन्त्रतन्त्रापेक्षदीक्षालक्षणाद् श्रद्धामात्रानुसरणान्मोक्षः इति सैद्धान्तिकवैशेषिकाः ।

2. Tārkikavaiśeṣikas, the regular Vaiśeṣikas.

द्रव्यगुणकर्मसामान्यसमवायान्त्यविशेषाभावाभिधानानां पदार्थानां साधर्म्य-वैधर्म्यावबोधतन्त्राद् ज्ञानमात्रात् इति तार्किकवैशेषिकाः ।

Viśeṣa is more specifically stated as Antyaviśeṣa; Abhāva is included as a Padārtha.

3. Pāśupatas. त्रिकालभस्मोद्धूलनेज्यागड्डुकप्रदानप्रदक्षिणीकरणात्म-विडम्बनादिक्रियाकाण्डमात्राधिष्ठानादनुष्ठानाद् (?) दिति पाशुपताः । See the *Pāśupata sūtras*, *TSS*. 143. I, 2 : भस्मना त्रिषवणं शयीत I-8 हसितगीतनृत्तडुंडुंकारनमस्कारजप्योपहारेणोपतिष्ठेत् । Gaḍukapradāna in Somadeva is perhaps the Duṇḍakāra or offering of a sound of that form : डुंडुंकारो नाम य एष जिह्वाग्रतालुसंयोगान् निष्पद्यते पुण्यो वृषनादसदृशः सः Kauṇḍinya's *Bhāṣya*, *ibid*. The Ātmaviḍambana referred to by Somadeva is probably the giving themselves away of the Pāśupatas, behaving as they pleased or engaging themselves in such activities as are referred

to in the *Pāsupata sūtras* III. 11—19 : प्रेतचरेत्, क्राथेत वा, स्पन्देत वा, मण्टेत वा, श्रृङ्गारेत वा, अपि तत् कुर्यात्, अपि तद् भाषेत etc.

P. 269 : Kulācāryas, followers of the Kasmirian Trika school : सर्वेषु पेयापेयभक्ष्याभक्ष्यादिषु निःशंकचित्ताद् वृत्तात इति कुलाचार्यकाः । तथा च त्रिकमतोक्तिः—मदिरामोदमेदुर × × × स्वयमुमामहेश्वरायमाणः कृष्णया सर्वाणीश्वरमाराधयेदिति ।

Sāṁkhyas : प्रकृतिपुरुषविवेकमतेः ख्यातेः इति सांख्याः ।

,, Buddhists : Nairātmyabhāvana as the means of salvation.

,, Mīmāṁsakas : अङ्गाराञ्जनादिवत् स्वभावादेव कालुष्योत्कर्षप्रवृत्तस्य चित्तस्य न कुतश्चिद् विशुद्धचित्तवृत्तिः इति जैमिनीयाः

,, Cārvākas or Bārhaspatyas who do not accept a substratum like Ātman, or a Paraloka. सति धर्मिणि धर्माश्चिन्त्यन्ते, ततः परलोकिनो भावात्, परलोकाभावे कस्यासौ मोक्षः, इति समवाप्तसमस्तनास्तिकाधिपत्या बार्हस्पत्याः ।

,, Vedāntins : परब्रह्मदर्शनवशादशेषभेदसंवेदनाविद्याविनाशाद् इति वेदान्तवादिनः ।

,, Another school of Buddhists, Śākyaviśesas, the Śūnyavādins :

नैवान्तस्तत्त्वमस्तीह न बहिस्तत्त्वमङ्गना ।
विचारगोचरातीतेः शून्यता श्रेयसी ततः ॥

इति पश्यतोहराः प्रकाशितशून्यतैकान्ततिमिराः शाक्यविशेषाः ।

,, Kāṇādas, but these should be the followers of Akṣapāda. ज्ञानसुखदुःखेच्छाद्वेषप्रयत्नधर्माधर्मसंस्काराणां नवसंख्यावसराणामात्मगुणानामत्यन्तोन्मुक्तिः मुक्तिः इति काणादाः । तदुक्तम्—

बहिः शरीराद्यद्रूपमात्मनः संप्रतीयते ।
उक्तं तदेव मुक्तस्य मुनिना कणभोजिना ॥

,, Buddhists again holding Nirvāṇa of Citta and Jīva. निराश्रयचित्तोत्पत्तिलक्षणो मोक्ष इति मोक्षावसरास्ताथागताः ।

---

[14] These two verses occur, with a slight change of the order of the halves and the quarters, in Aśvaghoṣa's *Saundarānanda*, XVI. 28-9. Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri drew my attention to this.

तदुक्तम्—

दिशं न काञ्चिद्विदिशं न काञ्चिद् नैवावनिं गच्छति नान्तरिक्षम् ।
दीपो यथा निर्वृतिमभ्युपेतः स्नेहक्षयात्केवलमेति शान्तिम् ॥
दिशं न काञ्चिद्विदिशं न काञ्चिन्नैवावनिं गच्छति नान्तरिक्षम् ।
जीवस्तथा निर्वृतिमभ्युपेतः क्लेशक्षयात्केवलमेति शान्तिम् ॥

P. 270: Kāpilas; more definitely Pātañjalas.

बुद्धिमनोऽहंकारविरहादखिलेन्द्रियोपशमावहात् तदा द्रष्टुः स्वरूपेऽवस्थानं मुक्तिः इति कापिलाः ।

,, Advaitins: यथा घटविघटने घटाकाशमाकाशीभवति, तथा देहोच्छेदात् सर्वः प्राणी परे ब्रह्मणि लीयत इति ब्रह्माद्वैतवादिनः ।

The Vedāntins previously mentioned are also represented as Abhedavādins.

Pp. 270-2: Criticism of all the above schools.

P. 272: Patañjali's two sūtras on Iśvara are quoted. Avadhūta's verse is again quoted.

,, Quotations from Svapnādhyāya.

P. 273: Here ends the first Kalpa of Upāsakādhyayana, styled 'Samasta-samaya-siddhānta-avabodha.'

P. 275 ff: Criticism as Anāptas of Brahminic gods and systems, Brahman, Śiva, Viṣṇu, Sun, etc., and Śaiva, Advaita, etc. In a verse on p. 276, the Saura school of sun-worship is pooh-poohed. In an earlier verse, the general Brahminic background is laughed at, as the Darśanas say one thing, the Purāṇas another, and the Kāvyas still another. In another verse here Somadeva points out that the Buddhistic thought was adopted by Śaṅkara, resorting to a double viewpoint, Dvaita and Advaita (Vyāvahārika and Pāramārthika):

द्वैताद्वैताश्रयः शाक्यः शंकरानुकृतागमः ।

,, Patañjali's Sūtra on Iśvara is quoted:

स पूर्वेषामपि गुरुः कालेनानवच्छेदात् ।

Pp. 276-7: Criticism again of Śaivism, referred to as Yoga; impossibility of Samyogasambandha between Śiva and Śakti.

P. 277 : Citation of the Vaiśeṣika view of Samavāya and the impossibility of Samavāyasambandha between Śiva and Śakti.

Then there is the interesting legend of Kaṇāda receiving the revelation from Śīva, in the form of an owl at Benares, referred to by Somadeva :

कथमन्यथा स्वत एव संजितषट्पदार्थावसायप्रसरे कणचरे वाराणस्यां महेश्वरस्य उलूकसायुज्यसरस्येदं वचः संगच्छेत्—'ब्रह्मातुला नामेदं दिवौकसां दिव्यमद्भुतं ज्ञानं प्रादुर्भूतमिह त्वयि, तद्वद्विधत्स्व विप्रेभ्यः ।'

P. 278 : Criticism of the Āptatva of Śruti and Smṛti. Here ends the 2nd kalpa which examines the Āptatva of other sects and schools of thought.

P. 282 : Ends 3rd kalpa on the topics of Āgama according to Jainism.

The rest of the book is taken up by the exposition, directly as well as through Upākhyānas, of Jaina-dharma for both Yatis and Gṛhasthas.

TRYAMBAKA IVA VIHITĀCALĀŚRAYAḤ

By DASHARATHA SHARMA

Both the *Pṛthvīrājavijaya* and the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* of Merutuṅga tell us that Mūlarāja took shelter in the *Kanthādurga* on being attacked by Vigraharāja II of Śākambharī.[1] Bühler found confirmation of their statement in the line "Tryambaka iva *vihitācalāśrayaḥ*" of the Kaḍī Grant of Mūlarāja himself which he (Bühler) thought could refer to Mūlarāja as well as Śiva, only if both could be proved to have resided on some mountain.[2] As there is not, however, a single hill within fifty miles of Aṇahillapattana, the capital of Mūlarāja, and the drafter of the Grant did not, according to Bühler, know of any better way of comparing the Cāulukya monarch with Śiva, he is believed to have boldly regarded this temporary stay of Mūlarāja on the Kanthā hill as equal to Śiva's residence on the Kailāśa mountain. The view thus propounded has found general acceptance with historians.

But, in view of the fact that no *praśastikāra* would like to mention a fact redounding to the discredit of his patron (and the shelter sought in Kanthā was surely nothing to boast about), we would rather interpret the line of the Kaḍī Grant, quoted above, to mean that Mūlarāja was like Tryambaka (Śiva) who has his *āśraya* (residence) on an *acala* (mountain Kailāśa), because of being the *āśraya* of acalā (the earth). Both were *acalāśraya*, though in different senses. That this is the meaning that the drafter intended would be obvious on going through another simile "*Kamalayoniriva vitatakamalāśraya*" found in the same Grant wherein Mūlarāja is compared

---

1 *Pṛthvīrājavijaya*, V, 50-53; *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, pp. 16-17.

2 *Indian Antiquary*, VI, pp. 183-84 and 1991-2, lines 2-3.

with Brahmā on account of being *Kamalāśraya* in the sense that he was the *āśraya* (refuge) of Kamalā (Lakṣmī), while Brahmā too was *Kamalāśraya*, though in the different sense of having his *āśraya* (seat) on a Kamala, *i.e.*, lotus. In the line under discussion, the word *āśraya* is connected with *acala* and *acalā* and in that quoted by us for comparison, with the words *Kamala* and *Kamalā*.

URDU MARSIYA (FROM EARLIEST TIME UP TO 1840 A.D.)

By CAPTAIN S. M. ZAMÍN ALI.

(*Continued from page* 94)

While these poets were flourishing in Delhi the school of Oudh was not falling back in making its contributions to Marsiyas. Sikandar, Afsurda and Gada in Lucknow and Mir Mohammad Ali Sabir and Mir Hasan in Fyzabad had gained reputation and were widely admired as good Marsiya writers. Sikandar has composed Marsiyas in Marwari, Punjabi and Purbi languages also and they are being recited in Majlises upto the present day. I have purposely left out the names of other Marsiya writers of this period as the line of their Marsiyas was identical to those composed by the above mentioned poets.

I will now give instances of Marsiyas composed in those days. They are the specimen of a perfect style, unsuperfluous, straightforward, impulsive, serene and full of pathos:—

گدا

امام تشنہ جگر نے پس نماز عشا
بہن کے سر کو لگا چھاتی ساتھہ رو رو کہا
کہ اے حبیبہ ام الائمۃ الحسنا
تیرے بلکنے سے کانپے ہیں ارض اور سما
فتادہ غلغلہ در قدسیاں ززاری تو
رسیدہ بلکہ سر عرش بیقراری تو
نہ لوٹ خاک پہ اتنا تو اے فلک ماری
نہ پیٹ چھاتی کو ہر دم بہ گریہ و زاری
ابھی تو مجھہ سے نہیں..........
ابھی تو زندگی میری میں رات ہے ساري

هنوز بررخ هجراں زشب نقابے نیست
بد بدھائے سحر یك نفس حجابے نیست
ابھی تو صبح شہادت کا کچھہ نہیں ھے اثر
ابھي تو شب کی طرح ھے سیاہ روئے سحر
ابھی قضا نے نہیں ھاتھہ میں لیا خنجر
نہ رکھہ دیائے مري پیاسي حلق کے اوپر
تو از برائے چہ نالان، و دیدہ گریانی
چہ صورت است کہ چوں خامہ مو پریشانی

افسردہ

جسکو پالا گود میں اب خاك میں دیکھونگی میں
ھے غضب اب لاشہ شبیر پر پیٹونگی میں
مجھکو سمجھاتے ھو تم اس غم میں کیا سمجھونگی میں
اور محشر تك ردا اپنے نہ سر پر لونگی میں
جسکا ایسا لعل ھو وے ذبح پھر وہ کیا کرے
ھے یہی لازم برھنہ سر ھو سر پیٹا کرے
سنتے ھو کنبہ مرا بیٹھا ھے قیدی بے پدر
زینب و کلثوم ھیں نالاں کھلے ھیں ان کے سر
میرا پوتا حلقۂ زنجیر میں ھے بے پدر
اور بہو بانو کا میرے لٹ گیا ھے سارا گھر
میرے پوتے مرگئے روتے ھیں سب میدان میں
ھے بجا گر خاك اوڑاؤں میں سر عریان میں
میري پوتي فاطمہ کبرا ھوئی بیوہ دولہن
تخت کے شب قید میں بیٹھی بیچاری خستہ تن
اسکے دولھا نے بسایا کربلا کا آج بن
دیکھیو حورو کہ کیا بیچین ھے میرا حسن
ایك تو بھائی کا غم اور دوسرے فرزند کا
آنکھہ سے آنسو نہیں تھمتا مرے دلبند کا

میداں میں سناں کھائی جب سینے پہ اکبر نے
اک شور کیا اوسدم اس شام کے لشکر نے
اوس شور کے اوٹھتے ہی فریاد کی سرور نے
آواز سنی گھر میں یہ بانوئے مضطر نے
بولی کہ یہ کیا غل تھا جو میں نے سنا ہے
فرزند مرا شاید گھوڑے سے گرا ہے
ہے رونے کی سرور کے اب مجھکو صدا آتی
تکلیف دل شہ نے میدان میں کچھہ پائی
کیوں دیر ہوئی گھرکو تشریف نہ فرمائی
اکبر کی مجھے لاکر کیوں شکل نہ دکھلائی
میں سوچتی جو کچھہ تھی انجام ہوا آخر
شہ روئے ہیں اکبر کا وہیں کام ہوا آخر
ہے ہے میں کسے بھیجوں جا رن کی خبر لاوے
ہے کون جو اکبر کو وہاں دیکھہ کے پھر آوے
اوس بچھڑے مسافر سے اللہ ہی ملواوے
کس طور سے یہ بانو بیٹے کی خبر پاوے
عباس گئے مارے قاسم بھی گئے مارے
دو رن میں حوادث میں نرغہ میں ہیں بیچارے

سکندر

ہے روایت شتر اسوار کسی کا تھا رسول
اون دنوں شہر مدینہ میں ہوا اسکا نزول
جس محلے میں بہم رہتے تھے حسنین و بتول
ایک لڑکی کھڑی دروازے پہ بیمار و ملول
خط لئے کہتی تھی پردے سے لگی زار و نزار
ادھر آ تجکو خدا کی قسم اے ناقہ سوار
ناگہاں سن شتر اسوار وہ آواز حزیں
باادب آکے یہ کہنے لگا پردے کے قریں
کوئی اس گھر میں دلاسے کو ترے ہے کہ نہیں
اتنی سی عمر میں کیا دکھہ ہے جو تو ہے غمگیں

کون سے قوم کي تو لڑکي ھے بیمار صغیر
کیا ترا نام ھے تو کسکے لئے ھے دلگیر

وہ لگی کہنے کہ سن بندۂ حیّ القیوم
میرا نانا ھے نبی دادا علی باب علوم
یہ محلہ بنی ھاشم کا ھے سبکو معلوم
اور میں لڑکی جو بیمار ھوں دکھیا مغموم

فاطمہ صغرا اسیواسطے میرا ھے نام
دادی زھرا کي سی صورت ھے مرے منھہ کی تمام
ایک تو فاقہ کشی دوسرے میں ھوں بیمار
گھرمیں دانہ نہیں کیا دوں تجھے اے ناقہ سوار
ایک مقنع ھے مرے سر پہ سودیتی ھوں اوتار
مینے بخشا اسے بھائی مرا خط لیکے سدھار
کھیو بابا سے کہ ھے فاطمہ صغرا بیچین
نام لے لیکے وہ مرجائیگی کھہ کھہ کے حسین

It should be carefully noted at this stage that all the poets aforesaid have written their Marsiyas after the fashion of Arabs and Persians, that is to say, they have mourned the death and briefly narrated the tragedy.

But in the works of some of the Northern as well as Southern poets traces can be found of those elements which appeared in a developed form in the works of the poets at a later stage.

The tide of Marsiya changed its course with the appearance of a man possessing extraordinary genius, viz., Mir Zamir, and his contemporaries like Mir Khaliq and others on the high platform of Marsiya writers at Lucknow. They did not like to beat the trodden path but carved out a new way for themselves. They changed the tone of Marsiyas, gave an entirely new form to it but took proper care to keep the spirit alright. They began to describe the whole event from beginning to the end adding poetic and rhetoric beauties to make the narration

dignified and interesting. They divided the Marsiya into five component parts viz., چہرہ (introduction) رخصت (Preparation of the warrior for battlefield and bidding adieu to his comrades and family) رجز (speech before war to intimidate the opponents) رزم (the battle) and شہادت (death and lamentations) each part having its own merit and being a complete subject in itself.

They adopted the form of مسدس and selected suitable and pleasant metres for it. The number of Bands used to vary between 40 and 60, i.e., each Marsiya contained 150 to 175 couplets. The poets showed in Marsiyas their knowledge of religion, literature, philosophy, tactics of war, feats of strength and fine arts. There is nothing wanting either to their imagination or fancy. They are teaming with action, character, feeling and thought and at the same time are full of grace and variety. In a word, they made Marsiya a literature and a distinct form of poetry in itself.

Although they made drastic changes and great improvement in the line of Marsiya but they could not realize their ideal. While they were about to reach the goal the icy hand of death stopped them. Their names shall always remain written in gold letters in the History of Urdu Literature as one who have laid down the foundation and made the plan of Epic Poetry in Urdu in the strict sense of the term as explained in the very beginning.

It would be great oblivion on my part if I do not mention the names of Dilgir and Faseeh in this connection who have done appreciable services in the reformation of Marsiyas and have composed their own on the new lines Faseeh has written Marsiyas in short as well as long metres and his compositions cannot be too much appreciated. There are many other Marsiya writers of this time whom I do not propose to mention simply because they used to

follow the lines of Mir Zamir and have made no innovation.

I will now give a few instances of the compositions made at this time. The period is all over marked with refinement of expression and dignity of imagination.

The credit of introducing progressive innovations mentioned above in the form of Marsiya goes to Mir Zamir who was followed by almost all the Marsiya writers of his age. He himself claims this superiority in the following stanza (بند)

جس سال لکھے وصف یہ ہمشکل نبی کے
سن بارہ سو اور پچاس تھے ہجری نبوی کے
آگے تو یہ انداز سنے تھے نہ کسی کے
اب سب یہ مقلد ہوئے اس طرز نوی کے
دس میں کہوں سو میں کہوں یہ ورد ہے میرا
جو جو کہے اس طرز میں شاگرد ہے میرا

دلگیر

شہید ظلم جو وہ شاہ تشنہ کام ہوا
بہ نوک نیزہ علم تب سر امام ہوا
حرم سرا میں لعینوں کا اژدہام ہوا
خیام شاہ میں انبوہ فوج شام ہوا
حرم کا زیور و زر لوٹنے لگے ظالم
حسین امام کا گھر لوٹنے لگے ظالم
ہوئی یہ حادثۂ آل عبا کی بربادی
کہ سر برہنہ ہوئی ایک ایک نبی‌زادی
ستمگروں نے یہ آل نبي کو ایذا دی
کہ بنت فاطمہ تھیں سر برہنہ فریادی
جلا جو خیمہ تو چھپنے کو کوئي جا نہ رہی
جناب زینب خاتون کی ردا نہ رہی

فصیح

سلام لکھتا ھوں میں حرم میں قلم سے زم زم ٹپک رھا ھے
سر اپنا کعبہ کے سنگ درپز' سیاہ پردہ پٹک رھا ھے
گھرے ھیں بادل سے شام کے دل' کھینچی ھے حیدر کی سیف براں
گھٹا میں بجلی چمک رھی ھے زمانہ آنکھیں جھپک رھا ھے
سکینہ پیاسی تڑپ رھی ھے پڑی ھے بیھوش بنت مسلم
ادھر کو اصغر سسک رھا ھے اُدھر کو باقر بلک رھا ھے
کہا یہ عابد نے ماں سے رو کر بچے نہ اصغر رھا میں زندہ
لگا گلے پر جو تیر ان کے جگر میں میرے کھٹک رھا ھے

Mir Khaliq describes the attack of the whole army at once on one single person in the following words :—

پیاسے پہ مثل ابر امنڈ آئے دل کے دل
شعلہ صفت چمکنے لگے برچھیونکے پھل
چلوں میں تیر رکھہ کے بڑھے روم ورے کے یل
تیغیں اُبھی ھوئی جو کھچیں ھٹ گئی اجل
دن کو سیاھئی شب ظلمات ھوگئی
کھولے نشان شامیوں نے رات ھوگئی

Here is a graphic description of sword by the same author:—

موجیں زرہ' حباب ھیں سر اسکے سامنے
شق ھیں بہادروں کے جگر اسکے سامنے
رکھتی ھے کیا بساط سپر اسکے سامنے
تنکے ھیں جبرئیل کے پر اسکے سامنے
مارے کمر کا ھاتھہ اگر پاؤں گاڑ کے
دو ٹکڑے آسیا کی طرح ھوں پہاڑ کے

The following extracts are taken from Marsiyas composed by Mir Zamir:—

خلعت جو ستاروں کا ھوا پیرھن شب
ناگہ گل خورشید نے لوٹا چمن شب

انجم گئے برباد ہوئي انجمن شب
آمادہ کیا صبح نے لاکر کفن شب
آراستۂ تخت فلک نیلو فری تھا
فرق شہ خاور پہ دھرا تاج زری تھا
جب چرخ کا وہ طائر زرین نظر آیا
زاغ سیہ شب نے نشیمن کو اُٹھایا
مرغابی انجم نے جو اك پرتوہ پایا
غوطہ دھن اس قلزم اخضر میں لگایا
پر آ حوگئے طائر بیضا کي چمك پر
کم ہونے لگا دمضۂ مہتاب فلك پر
اورنگ نشین شرف صفحۂ طارم
جسوقت ہوا زیب دہ قصر چہارم
تب چار طرف لٹنے لگے گوہر انجم
گوہر کہاں پھر خود طبق ماہ ہوا گم
خورشید اُٹھا لے گیا میدان سے رن کے
خود سر مہتاب کو نیزے سے کرن کے

جسوقت کیا مہر نے زریں طبق صبح
طفلان کواکب ہوئے محو سبق صبح
تھا خط شعاعي سے طلائي ورق صبح
جوں جدول شنجرف بہار شفق صبح
نور نظر عالم ارباب تھا خورشید
مہر خظ معزولی مہتاب تھا خورشید
جب عرصۂ گردون پہ نشاں مہر کا چمکا
گویا شفق صبح پھریرا تھا علم کا
اختر ہوا طالع شہ خاور کے حشم کا
اثواج کواکب کو ہوا حوصلہ رم کا
قرص مہ کامل نہ رہا آپ کے اوپر
مہتاب لگی چھوٹنے مہتاب کے اوپر

میداں میں آمد آمد قاسم کی دھوم ھے
اور زلزلہ میں کشور سلطان و روم ھے
ارض و سما میں جن و ملک کا ھجوم ھے
اک حملہ میں بہشت بزیر قدوم ھے
غل ھے کہ یہ ریاض حسن کا نہال ھے
ابن کنندۂ درۂ خیبر کا لال ھے
اس حسن پر پڑی جو نگاہ سپاہ شام
کوئی درود بھیجتا تھا اور کوئی سلام
کہتا تھا کوئی میں تو ھوں اس شخص کا غلام
دادا امام باپ امام اور چچا امام
اسکے سبب زمیں کو ھے فخر آسمان پر
وہ ھاتھہ قطع ھوں جو اٹھیں اس جوان پر
جو جو کہ اس سپاہ میں بے رحم تھے کھڑے
ان سبکے اس مقام پہ آنسو نکل پڑے
بولے کہ اس سے صاحب اولاد کیا لڑے
دیکھا یہ ابن سعد لعیں نے کھڑے کھڑے
جا کر کہا یہ ازرق شامی کے کان میں
نام و نشاں مٹادے حسن کا جہان میں
ازرق نے اپنے ایک پسر سے کہا کہ ھاں
جلدی سے لا سر اس پسر ھاشمی کایاں
آیا مقابلہ میں وہ کرکے سبک عناں
قاسم نے اپنے ھاتھہ میں نیزے کودی تکاں
سینے سے پار ھوگیا مارا جو زور سے
تحسین کی صدا ھوئی رستم کے گور سے
تب دوسرے پسر نے کیا قصد رزم گاہ
آیا وہ اس غضب سے کہ اللہ کی پناہ
دے خالی اسکے وار کو آخر وہ رشک ماہ
چمکا کے تیغ بولا کہ ھاں لے تو روسیاہ

آنکھ اسکی واں تو رعب کے مارے جھپک گئی
اتنے میں تیغ فرق سے لے تنگ تک گئی

فرزند سیومی ہوا مصروف امتحاں
شمشیر کھینچ کر وہ وہیں سے ہوا رواں
قاسم نے زور بازوئے حیدر کیا عیاں
پٹکے کو تھام پھینکدیا سوئے آسماں
جب ہوگیا بلند تو سر کو فرو کیا
گرنے لگا زمین کے اوپر تو دو کیا

چوتھا پسر رواں ہوا مانند فیل مست
اک تیغ مثل تختۂ در تھام کر بدست
تو شاہ نے دکھائی اسے طرفہ ضرب دست
اسوقت کھل گیا سخن فتح اور شکست
سینے میں آکے دھنس گیا خود ایک مشت میں
صدمے سے ضرب آ گئی گھوڑے کی پشت میں

یاں تھے کھڑے جو اکبر و عباس نامور
کیا دیکھتے ہیں وہ سوئے میداں اٹھاکے سر
قاسم کی سمت آتا ہے ارزق بچشم تر
گرز گراں ہے ہاتھ میں مبہوت سر بسر
چاروں پسر کی لاش تو پیش نگاہ ہے
آنکھوں سے سوجھتا نہیں عالم سیاہ ہے

ہر آنکھ طاس خون ہے غصہ سے منہ میں کف
آتا ہے فیل مست کی مانند پیش صف
یاں پاؤں ڈالتا ہے تو پڑتا ہے اسطرف
اور بج رہا ہے فوج میں قرنا و کوس و دف
اکبر نے اس لعین کی جو آمد نگاہ کی
قاسم کی کمسنی پہ نظر کرکے آہ کی

یاں ہورہی تھی قاسم و ارزق سے کارزار
یہ اسکا وار روکتے تھے اور وہ ان کا وار

گرد اسقدر اڑی تھی کہ جسکا نہیں شمار
ڈوبے ہوئے پسینے میں تھے دونوں راھوار
اسکی ہوئی نہ فتح نہ ان کی ظفر ہوئی
هفتاد ضرب رد و بدل یکدگر ہوئی
وہ توڑتا تھا تول کے جب گرز گاؤ سر
یہ روکتے تھے ضرب بدن کو سمیٹ کر
پڑتا تھا گرز آن کے یوں بر سر سپر
لنگر سے اسکے ھلتی تھی رھوار کی کمر
اور انکی تیغ پڑتی تھی اس دھوم دھام سے
آتی تھی مرحبا کی صدا آسمان سے
قاسم سے یوں لڑا وہ لعیں کر کے جد و کد
حیدر سے جوں لڑا عمر بن عبد ود
تو شاہ نے کہا اُسی حملوں کو کر کے رد
گھوڑے کا تنگ کھل گیا اے مرد بے خرد
وہ اپنے سر جھکانے میں کرتا درنگ تھا
یاں اس درنگ میں نہ وہ سر تھا نہ تنگ تھا

دکھلائے خدا داغ نہ فرزند جواں کا
یہ داغ خریدار ہے ماں باپ کی جاں کا
اولاد کا غم شغل ہے فریاد و فغاں کا
جب ہو نہ دلارام تو آرام کہاں کا
یہ داغ کسی صاحب اولاد سے پوچھو
شبیر سے یا بانوئے ناشاد سے پوچھو

نکلا جو سر مہر گریبان سحر سے
انجم کے گہر گر گئے دامان سحر سے
مہتاب کا رنگ اُڑ گیا دامان سحر سے
روشن ہوا صحرا رخ سامان سحر سے
جو وادی ایمن میں ہوا طور کا عالم
وہ خیمۂ شبیر میں تھا نور کا عالم

وہ نور کا تڑکا ادھر اور صبح کا عالم
گھٹتا مہ و انجم کی تجلی کا وہ کم کم

آتی تھی صدائے دہل صبح بھی پیہم
چلتی تھی نسیم سحری دشت میں تھم تھم

کرتا تھا چراغ سحری عزم سفر کا
اور شور درختوں پہ وہ مرغان سحر کا

پہچانتے ہو کس کی مرے سر پہ ہے دستار
دیکھو تو عبا کس کے ہے کاندھے پہ نمودار

یہ کس کی زرہ کسکی سپر کسکی ہے تلوار
میں جسپہ سوار آیا ہوں کس کا ہے یہ رہوار

باندھا ہے کمر میں جسے یہ کسکی ردا ہے
کیا فاطمہ زہرا نے نہیں اسکو سیا ہے

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

SAROD RASACANDRIKĀ, by Mr. Nirendra Krishna Mitra of Shobha Bazar, Rajbati. Price Rs. 5.

Sarod Rasacandrikā is one of the few text-books in existence on instrumental music in India. It gives in notation 312 Rāgas with Tan, Jhala, Thāt, etc., as imparted by the late Ustad Amir Khan of Bengal, who was well-known all over India as a Sarod player of remarkable ability. These "gats" are applicable to all stringed instruments and should prove a mine of information to advanced students in instrumental music. The late Ustad Amir Khan has left a large number of pupils in Bengal some of whom, e.g., Sj. Radhika Mohan Moitra, have been greatly appreciated at the various sessions of the Allahabad University Music Conference and other places.

This book has been written in a lucid style, with an introductory chapter, which includes interesting questions and answers on the theory of music. Each Rāga is prefaced by an idea of the time when it should be played, its tāla and class to which it belongs. The book would cater to the needs of a wider public if it could be translated in Hindi.

The author, Mr. Nirendra Krishna Mitra of Shobha Bazar, Rajbati, deserves hearty congratulations for putting into the market a treatise of great importance on instrumental music. The book is priced at Rs. 5 and is dedicated to the author's elder brother, the late Sj. Ganendra Krishna Mitra.

D. R. Bhattacharya

GLORIES OF MARWAR AND THE GLORIOUS RATHORS, by Mm. Pt. Bisheshwar Nath Reu, published by the Archaeological Department, Jodhpur, 1943. Pages i—lxiv + 273. Price Rs. 3-4-0.

The *Glories of Marwar* by Pt. Bisheshwar Nath Reu is an attempt at describing the history of the Rathor Principality of Marwar. The Introduction chronicles briefly the events of the reigns of various rulers who have sat on the *gaddi* of that State and in certain particulars new information has been supplied by the author. But the method of treatment is highly defective and there is not much evidence of careful discrimination or weighing of facts culled from State-records in the light of Persian histories. The book abounds in inaccuracies and the language is not free from mistakes of idiom and grammar. The account of Rao Maldeva's relations with Humayun is not quite correct and so is the account of Maharaja Ajit Singh. The author writes distinctly with a Rathor bias and fails to estimate precisely the importance of events and the actions of personalities when they came into conflict with other powers.

There is one important aspect of the book which must be noted. It will serve as a good source book for the history of Marwar for it contains a large number of inscriptions, letters and documents which will enable students of Rajasthan to add much to their knowledge of the history of that picturesque part of the earth. Many of these documents have been translated by Mm. Reu with care and they are bound to prove useful to the historian.

Mm. Reu has incorporated into the volume his articles contributed to journals and papers read at conferences and congresses. These occupy 264 pages out of nearly 331 in the book. The appendices are larger than the text of history. The history proper of Marwar chronicled by the

author runs only into 62 pages. The *Glories of Marwar* is thus merely a collection of papers and articles of Mm. Reu already printed in journals or read at literary congregations. It would have been better if Mm. Reu had in his history utilised all the information and given us a systematic and critical survey of the development of Marwar. Still the book is bound to prove useful to students of Rajput history and will admirably serve as a source book for researchers.

—Ishwari Prasad

Śrī Śrī Caitanyacaritāmṛta : (Ādikhaṇḍa), by Śrī Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja Goswāmī, along with a running commentary in Bengali and Sanskrit by Mr. Vidhibhusan Sarkar and published by Śrī Mādādā Kāryālaya, Illupar, Barisal. Pages 523. Price Rs. 7.

Śrī Caitanyacaritāmṛta is a well-known work on the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava School. The volume under review contains only the Ādilīlā section of it. There have been several editions of this book, but the present volume with its Bengali and Sanskrit notes is undoubtedly much more useful in bringing out the meaning of the text. The style of the commentaries is quite interesting and lucid. Both the commentator and the publisher deserve our congratulations for this fine edition. Mr. Sarkar has further shown his devotion to the school by bringing out several smaller works dealing with different aspects of the teachings of Caitanya.

Brahmasūtrabhāṣyanirṇaya, by Cidghanānanda Purī. Published by Ramakrishna Sewashrama, Benares, 1943. Pages 263.

It has been a problem with the students of Indian philosophy to find out how there have been so many different and independent interpretations of the same *Brahmasūtra*.

We know that there are more than ten different commentaries representing different schools at present. It is very gratifying to note that the learned Swāmī, Cidghanānandajī, has brought out a book dealing with this problem. The book under review is divided into two parts. It deals with the various aspects of the *Brahmasūtra*: its authorship, the ultimate aim of the work, the probable date of its composition,. the method adopted in the arrangement of the Sūtras, its relation with Buddhism and Jainaism, Gauḍapāda and Buddhism and similar other topics.

Next he discusses the arrangement of the Sūtras and the adhikaraṇas according to Śaṅkara, Bhāskara, Rāmānuja, Nimbārka, Madhva, Śrīkaṇṭha, Śrīkara, Vallabha, Vijñāna Bhikṣu, and Baladeva. He tries to find out the points of similarities and dis-similarities between these various authors on the above quest'on. After a critical survey of the work he comes to the conclusion that the interpretation of Śaṅkara alone faithfully represents the view-point of Vyāsa, the author of the Sūtra work.

The treatment, though very brief, is quite interesting and is based on internal evidences. He has examined almost all the points very carefully. It would have been far better if the author had gone into the depth of the problems to find out the causes which led to the differences amongst the Ācāryas while arranging the Sūtras and the Adhīkaraṇas for their respective philosophy. However, the author deserves congratulation for his valuable service to the cause of Indian philosophy. Students working on this line will find the book very useful.

Jñānadīpikā. A Commentary by Devabodha on the Ādiparvan of the *Mahābhārata*. Edited by Dr. R. N. Dandekar, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, 1941.

The importance of the work which the Bhandarkar Research Institute is doing in publishing the critical edition of the *Mahābhārata* and its commentaries cannot be exaggerated. It has recently published the commentary of Devabodha, called *Jñānadīpikā*, which is regarded as the oldest commentary extant on the *Mahābhārata*. Though very brief, it is very important both for the understanding and the constitution of the text of the Epic. It explains only difficult words and passages in the text and also sometimes gives the gist of the passages. Almost all the later commentators on the Epic have referred to this commentary and some have actually based their glosses on it. It is very gratifying to learn that the Bhandarkar Institute intends publishing Devabodha's commentary on *Sabhā*, *Udyoga*, *Bhīṣma*, and *Droṇa* parvans also. The editor deserves congratulation for having undertaken such an important work.

Mīrālaharī by Panditā S. Kshamā Devī Rao, 37, New Marine Lane, Bombay with a Foreword by Dr. Amaranatha Jha, Vice-chancellor, Allahabad University. Price Rs. 2-8.

India has produced several high class poetesses from time to time. Śīlā, Vijjikā, Mārulā, Vikaṭanitambā, Indulekhā, Lakhimā, Triveṇī, etc., are too well-known amongst the old poetesses. Even at the present day we have scholars amongst the ladies who are doing good work in Sanskrit. Paṇḍitā Śrīmatī Kshamā Devī is one of them. She possesses a unique combination of Eastern and Western scholarship. She is well-acquainted with several

European languages and has written extensively both in English and Sanskrit. Her earlier works in Sanskrit are: सत्याग्रहगीता, कथापञ्चकम्, विचित्रपरिषद्यात्रा, and शङ्करजीवनाख्यानम्।

The work under review is her latest work. In it she deals with the life and work of Mirā Bai, the well-known devotional figure of our country. The book is divided into two parts consisting of 91 and 44 verses, respectively. All the verses are written in the शार्दूलविक्रीडित metre. She has herself added an easy and lucid Sanskrit Commentary to this work.

Every verse in this book has got its own charm. Natural and smooth flow of the verses mixed with every poetic excellence makes the work much more attractive. With the sublime nature of the subject, the grace and purity of thoughts and language and the beauties of poetics, the work deserves a high place in Sanskrit literature. Indeed, the work is a source of great inspiration for the younger generation. The author deserves every praise for this excellent achievement.

Prācīna Bāṅgālā Patra Saṅkalana, compiled and edited by Dr. S. N. Sen, M.A., B.Litt, Ph.D., Keeper of the Records of the Govt. of India Published by the Calcutta University, 1942.

The Government of India possesses valuable records in the form of letters written in various oriental languages. The majority of the letters are in Persian. Through the efforts of the late Sir Denison Ross all the letters written in Persian, amounting to 13,301, have been translated into English and published in eight volumes. The Government of India has now decided to publish letters written in other languages. The Records Office has so far found out letters in the following languages: 1 in Chinese and Arakani; 2 in

Bhutani, Kanarese, and Tibetian; 7 in Burmese; 12 in Uriya; 18 in Sanskrit; 175 in Bengali; 227 in Marathi; and 354 in Hindi Besides these, there are several letters in Gurumukhi.

These letters disclose various historical facts not known so far through any other source. Realising the importance of these letters for the reconstruction of history in India, the Government of India have permitted their publication. Different responsible Institutions have been authorised to publish them. It is likely that the Ganganatha Jha Research Institute may undertake to publish the letters in Sanskrit, a few of which have already been published in its Journal.

The book under review is the first volume of the Records in Oriental languages series. It is divided into two parts. The first part contains critical Introduction in Bengali, the original letters and annotations including a glossary of difficult and uncommon words, while the second part consists of English Introduction, English synopses, notes and bibliography. The letters are very important. They cover the period between 1772 to 1820 and reveal various facts of historical and social importance. For a student of history working on the period, the volume is very useful.

PROGRESS OF GREATER INDIA RESEARCH (1917-42), by Dr. U. N. Ghoshal, M.A., Ph.D.,—viii + 114 + viii, published by the Greater India Society, 35, Badurbagan Row, Calcutta. Price Rs. 4.

Dr. U. N. Ghoshal of Calcutta wrote a long and interesting article for the *Progress of Indic Studies* (1917-42) published by the BHANDARKAR RESEARCH INSTITUTE, giving an account of knowledge acquired about Afghanistan, Central Asia, Tibet, Mongolia, Manchuria, Burma, Siam,

Cambodia, Champa, Java, Bali, Borneo, Celebes, Sumatra, Malay and Celyon within about the last 50 years. He recapitulated how Great Britain, U. S. A., France, Germany, Japan, China and other countries sent out archæological expeditions to the above countries, and how the results of the finds and discoveries were embodied in the numerous illustrated reports published by the different countries. It was from this material that scholars of the world started reconstructing the history of the long-lost civilisations and peoples. The present book is a reprint of the above article with the addition of a useful index and bibliography.

Time there was when all sorts of humiliating historical theories were aired by scholars imbued with racial prejudices about problems relating to India. Instead of Indian Aryans being admitted as having migrated to other countries and given them their civilisations, the arbitrary theory was set up that they themselves came to India from outside. Recent discoveries, however, and specially those at Ur, Kish, Boghaz-Kui and Tel-el-Amarna are now furnishing refutation of this. Similarly Bühler's theory that our Brahmi script had been borrowed from the Semitic ones has been ably exploded by Ojha and other scholars of this country. The researches outlined in the present booklet are of special interest and pride to India as they furnish irrefutable material indicating the activities of Indians in these countries as pioneers of civilisation for the last over 2000 years.

The book does not confine itself to the quarter of century alone but goes back to the last decades of the last century when expeditions were started and discoveries began to be made in quick succession. The publication is nicely got up and is indispensable for every scholar of history.

— B. P. Singh.

INDEX TO VOLUME I

Articles

Authors

Reviews of Books